

Journal of the Royal Society of Arts

NO. 5050

SEPTEMBER 1960

VOL. CVIII

AWARD OF THE R. B. BENNETT COMMONWEALTH PRIZE FOR 1960

On the recommendation of the Commonwealth Section Committee, and with the approval of His Royal Highness the President, the Council has awarded the R. B. Bennett Commonwealth Prize for 1960 to Dr. E. W. R. Steacie, O.B.E., F.R.S., President of the National Research Council of Canada, 'for his contributions to the development of pure and applied science in Canada and in the Commonwealth'.

Dr. Steacie was appointed President of the National Research Council in 1952 in recognition of the unusual qualities of leadership which he had shown as Director of the N.R.C.'s Division of Chemistry and of his many contributions to various wartime organizations. One of his most enduring and widely felt earlier achievements was the institution in 1948 of a postdoctorate fellowship scheme which has been the means of bringing over a thousand young scientists from all over the world to Canada for periods of a year or two.

Under Dr. Steacie's guidance the National Research Council has developed into an organization that is universally respected in scientific circles, and known in Canada particularly for the prominent part it has played in the nurture of the country's natural and human resources. Dr. Steacie has not used his position to bring about the centralization of the sciences into one large institution, but has been concerned to encourage scientists and scientific groups wherever they may be found. It is largely through his influence that the Federal Government's support of scientific studies in Canadian universities has been greatly increased in the last eight years. This support has borne fruit in the large output of work achieved and in the quality of young scientists themselves.

One important reason for Dr. Steacie's success is that despite his administrative responsibilities he has continued to carry out his own scientific research. His contributions to the study of photochemistry have gained for him some of the highest distinctions, as for example his election as foreign member of the Academies of Science of both the United States and the U.S.S.R.

AWARD FOR JOURNALISM IN THE COMMONWEALTH

Acting upon a recommendation recently made by the Commonwealth Section Committee, the Council has decided to institute a new award, to be made to an

individual journalist selected from any country of the Commonwealth except the United Kingdom. The award, consisting of a silver medal and diploma, will be made to the working journalist, properly accredited to an established newspaper, periodical or news agency, who, in the opinion of judges appointed by the Society, 'has, during the last three years, made the most distinguished contribution to the highest standards of his profession both by the quality, accuracy and objectivity of his work and by his example, and has best promoted amongst his own people a closer understanding and appreciation of the problems and achievements of his country and of the Commonwealth as a whole'.

With the co-operation of the Colonial Office and the Commonwealth Press Union, arrangements are now being made to obtain recommendations for the award through specially instituted committees in overseas Commonwealth countries. Direct applications are therefore not invited. It is expected that the first award to be made will be announced in the early spring of 1961.

1959 INDUSTRIAL ART BURSARIES EXHIBITION

As announced in the July issue of the *Journal*, the exhibition of designs submitted in the 1959 Industrial Art Bursaries Competition will be on view at the Belfast College of Art from 5th to 24th September.

1958 INDUSTRIAL ART BURSARIES EXHIBITION IN AUSTRALIA

The exhibition of winning and commended entries submitted in the 1958 Industrial Art Bursaries Competition, which was shown recently in Melbourne, Australia, at the request of the School of Art, Royal Melbourne Technical College, was the first such exhibition to be sent overseas by the Society. The opening ceremony on 4th July was performed by Mr. J. R. A. Glenn, Managing Director of Imperial Chemical Industries of Australia and New Zealand, and a member of the Industrial Design Council of Australia. A large company was present, including Councillor Bernard Evans, who is Lord Mayor of Melbourne and President of the Council of the Royal Melbourne Technical College, and a number of Australian Fellows. A message of congratulation and good wishes was read from Mr. Oswald P. Milne, Chairman of Council of the Society.

During its run the exhibition attracted many visitors, amongst them a considerable number of senior students of industrial design from schools in and near Melbourne, who were generally impressed by the high standard of work displayed.

THE SOCIETY'S CHRISTMAS CARD

The order form for the Society's Christmas card which is included at the back of this *Journal* bears an illustration of Miss Anna Zinkeisen's painting of the trial of ships' models conducted by the Society in 1762, together with full details of prices, which are in all cases the same as last year.

In settling the technical details of her picture, Miss Zinkeisen has been greatly helped by advice from Dr. W. T. O'Dea of the Science Museum.

THE WRITING OF DANIEL DEFOE

The Peter Le Neve Foster Lecture by

BONAMY DOBRÉE, O.B.E., M.A., D. de Dijon,

Emeritus Professor of English Literature, University of

Leeds, delivered to the Society on Wednesday, 27th April,

1960, with John Robert Moore, A.M., Ph.D., Professor

of English, University of Indiana, in the Chair

THE CHAIRMAN: Three hundred years ago Daniel Defoe was born in London. We are not sure of the day or the month, but from a statement in one of his tracts and from his marriage licence, we know that the year was 1660. If Defoe could see his London to-day he would be proud that his tercentenary was going to be celebrated in Stoke Newington, where he wrote his greatest books. He would be proud that the Butchers' company has honoured him, together with Shakespeare, as a butcher's son. He would be proud of the tall monument in Bunhill Fields, paid for largely by the sixpences of schoolchildren. He would be proud that the Royal Society of Arts is remembering him to-day. He was not a founding father of this Society, for he died twenty-three years before it was organized, but he was certainly a founding grandfather. When Henry Baker was an ambitious young man and making a name for himself by his system of teaching the deaf and dumb to speak, Defoe invited him to his home in Stoke Newington, gave a magnificent endorsement of his method of teaching, wrote a leading article for the first number of his *Universal Spectator*, and finally accepted him as the husband of his favourite daughter—and hence as the ancestor-to-be of Defoe's last known descendants in England. I am assured that Baker took a very active part in the foundation and early organization of the Society. He attended the first meeting in March, 1754, when it was decided to found this Society, and he had a great deal to do with the drafting of the original constitution and its early administration. In recognition of these services he was elected a perpetual member of the Society in 1755.

Defoe had an even greater influence as the foster-grandfather of this Society, for your Benjamin Franklin medal is awarded in honour of a member who was in many ways the best disciple that Defoe ever had. Franklin was a young printer for John Watts, and once was employed to set up Defoe's *The Compleat English Gentleman*. James Roberts was for some time Defoe's principal bookseller, and it was to Roberts that Franklin introduced his friend James Ralph, who sought to establish a new periodical. Franklin praised Defoe's use of dialogue, he admired his didactic writings, and he recalls gratefully 'an essay on projects which perhaps gave me a turn of thinking that had an influence on some of the principal future events of my life'. Through a London bookseller Franklin did recover a large collection of political tracts which had once belonged to his own grandfather, a collection from the Restoration to the age of Queen Anne which must have contained a great many of Defoe's tracts. When Franklin stood almost alone in America seeking to preserve a connection with Great Britain he was sustaining a favourite thesis of Defoe's: that the American Colonies have so many interests in common with Britain that they should never be separated; and when Franklin wrote such ironical tracts as *Rules by which a great empire may be reduced to a small one* and *Edict by the King of Persia*, he wrote as no one ever wrote before Defoe.

Defoe would have taken a personal interest in every one of the many topics which appear in the annual proceedings of this Society. However, it is not as a projector

that he is being remembered here this afternoon, but as an author. It is fitting that the Peter Le Neve Foster Lecture should be given by a distinguished writer, a literary critic who is also known as a literary historian of the age in which Defoe lived. Defoe's publications are numbered by the hundred and Professor Dobrée is the author and editor of many notable works. Defoe was an observer of many lands, and Colonel Dobrée has been a traveller. Defoe was one of the first and most ardent advocates of the municipal university, and Professor Dobrée has contributed to the prestige of the University of Leeds as its Professor, now Emeritus Professor, of English Literature. Defoe insisted that he knew how to write and that any apparent carelessness in his writing was due to his desire to reach the general public, and Professor Dobrée is eminent for his studies of the art of writing and he has been a pioneer in analysing the subtleties of Defoe's prose-style. It is a pleasure and an honour to introduce the distinguished speaker this afternoon.

The following lecture was then delivered.

THE LECTURE

In celebrating the tercentenary of Daniel Defoe's birth, we would wish, naturally, to signal his great achievements. I use the plural, for one of the many staggering things about him is his astonishing variety. I feel that I cannot do better than to give as the background of my talk, to be confined to one aspect, the words written about him many years ago by W. P. Trent. During an unimaginably busy and everlastingly harried life, Defoe contrived to be, Mr. Trent said, 'an important politician as well as an influential journalist . . . one of the best-known of all Englishmen during the reigns of William III, Queen Anne, and George I. He was, moreover, a historian, a biographer, a poet, an essayist, a political economist, a sociologist, a religious controversialist, a moralist, a writer on occult subjects [one might add, a military strategist on an imaginative scale, a landscape gardener, and a stout advocate of women's rights]. In short, a Proteus both in literature and affairs, who when he is viewed in the light of the totality of his powers and performances, seems to be an almost titanic genius.' The very bulk of his writings—over 500 works—is dismaying. Few of us indeed can have read more than a tiny proportion of his output, and even then, perhaps, not very fully. How many have read the Third Part of *Robinson Crusoe*? What do most know of his verse apart from that gloriously successful political squib, *The True-Born Englishman*? How many read that tractate on education, *The Compleat English Tradesman*?

Yet, I suppose most will agree, it is upon *Robinson Crusoe* that his fame chiefly rests. It has become a universal myth, that of man in his isolation affirming himself (with, of course, the help of Providence) against the created world. Other interpretations, I know, have been offered. It is, so we are asked to think, a kind of brochure, or manifesto, on behalf of emergent bourgeois capitalism. How this is to be reconciled with Rousseau's allowing it to be Émile's only reading, I do not quite understand; the simpler explanation seems preferable to me. But if *Robinson Crusoe* is Defoe's most famous book, I, for my part, consider *Moll Flanders* to be the more important, because it is the more seminal. *Robinson Crusoe* has no real successors: how could it have? But from *Moll Flanders* springs the whole broad stream of the modern novel. Its striking

originality consists in its being for the first time about—like it or not—people such as you and me caught up in the meshes of society. What is so remarkable about this book, as it is about many others, beginning, one might say, from the early account (1706) of *The Apparition of Mrs. Veal*, is Defoe's capacity to identify himself with the person he is describing, an amazing effort of the creative imagination. And, however much this may be true, all the while Defoe himself appears with his immense sympathy with all sorts and conditions of people, and his apparently unconscious irony. I say 'apparently', and I would stress the word, because I am not at all sure how far Defoe may have been perfectly aware of what he was doing.

However, I can take it for granted that my audience this afternoon is well acquainted with all this, as it will be with his other achievements, each of which alone would justify his commemoration: such as *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, *The Journal of the Plague Year*, the *Tour Through the Whole of Great Britain*, besides many of the other novels, and the travel books. But what I should like to dwell on here is the variety, I would almost say the complexity of his style. Moreover in discussing his prose manner, or again, as I hope to show, manners, in the plural, I shall quote largely from his lesser-known works, for reasons that will appear. I shall raid his *Review*, that thrice-weekly journal which ran for nine years (for a time it appeared five times a week), a stupendous performance; and his Puritan conduct-books, which form a large part of his output. True, he would argue, at any rate in public, that all his books were conduct-books, tending to that Reformation of Manners, the desire for which composed a considerable part of his driving force; but the novels are not so direct.

My subject, then, is Defoe's style. Everybody is familiar with the phrase, met with time and again, 'The plain and simple style of Bunyan and Defoe'. We have only to think of the phrase for a moment to wonder whether it shows much critical acumen to lump the two together; even at their plainest and simplest they are markedly different; and moreover Bunyan is not always so seemingly simple, so artfully plain, as he is in the *Pilgrim's Progress*. The implication of the phrase is that words flowed from Defoe's pen as they do from the mouth of the most talkative fellow, who gives no heed to how he says anything. Defoe, however, is almost infinitely varied, and it is clear after a rather wider reading than is usually given him, that he was acutely conscious of what he was doing, and that he had the arts of rhetoric so readily at his command that he could use them so that his language seemed a spontaneous flow.

Perhaps it would be as well to look at what Defoe himself said about his style, notably in his *Essay Upon Projects*, printed in 1698, though possibly written some years earlier. At the end he remarks:

As for such who read Books only to find out the Author's *faux Pas*, who will quarrel at the Meanness of Stile, errors of Pointing, Dulness of Expression, or the like, I have but little to say to them . . . As to Language, I have been rather careful to make it speak *English* suitable to the Manner of the Story, than to dress it up with Exactness of Stile; choosing rather to have it Free and Familiar . . . than to strain at a Perfection of Language, which I rather wish for, than pretend to be Master of.

And now from a conduct-book on marriage,* printed in 1727:

I might say a word or two more with respect to Style. I think I can have given no Offence in Decency of Expression.

What can we deduce from these two statements? This, I think: that by 'style' Defoe meant chiefly the choice of words. They must be understandable, *English* as he insisted, and suitable to the manner of the story, that is to the matter being talked about; and further, as will become evident, suitable for the person supposed to be talking about it, and to the audience addressed. That is already to suggest that the way of putting words together might vary, as well as the words used. On occasion, then, the way of writing might be very far from 'plain and simple'; even the words might be difficult, and the structure passably complex. True it is that Defoe never had time 'to polish and refine'; all was written at immense speed. But since he was a born artist in words, the tone, what we call the style, *seems* to have come to him naturally; thus it varies enormously, according as he is being hortatory, admonitory, ironic, humorous, trying to exalt his reader, or just getting on with a tale. Yet always it has the effect of considered art. Let me take one brief instance from an early number of *Review*, where he retorts calmly on those who have threatened him with assassination, pointing out how unpleasant it is to be hanged:

Gaols, Fetters, and Gibbets are odd Melancholy things; for a Gentleman to *Dangle out of the World in a Strang* [*sic*] has something so Ugly, so Awkward, and so Disagreeable in it, that you cannot think of it, without some regret.

It is beautifully done. How belittling to *dangle* out of the world! Here is no heroic criminal, no Jonathan Wild. And then the order of the adjectives—so ugly, so awkward, so disagreeable—it's a lovely toning down. No wonder you cannot think of such a death without some regret! Plain? Yes indeed, plain enough. But simple? The question answers itself.

We must now ask ourselves who was Defoe writing for, or rather, one would say, writing at? It was the surging world of business and political London, more and more dominated by a rising middle class of traders big and small, eager to know what was going on, eager to know what to think, and to have a hand in the game; not much given to quiet reading, but asking to be as it were addressed from the street corner. Charles Leslie, writer of a rival paper *The Rehearsal*, was goaded into remarking: '... the greatest Part of the *People* do not Read Books. Most of them cannot *Read* at all. But they will gather together about one that can *Read*, and listen to an *Observer* or *Review* (as I have seen them in the streets)'. But these, just as much as the City clerks, the smaller fry of gentry, or men of the Inns of Court, were intelligent and alert: they would take the point of a thing though it might have to be pressed home. Defoe knew wonderfully well how to handle them through successive numbers of *Review*, and I will take as an example some numbers of July, 1705, when, as a good Dissenter, and a man indefatigably working for moderation, making it a principle, he is countering the Tory party-cry of 'The Church in danger', raised in the hope

* *Conjugal Lewdness; or Matrimonial Whoredom.*

of off-setting the Whig success in the war against France. In the opening paper of the 14th we read (I truncate a good deal: Defoe was seldom sparing of paper):

'Tis necessary therefore for me to Examine this Mighty, this Deplorable Thing, the Danger of the Church . . .

1. Who they are that cry out of the *Churches Danger*, and are so Exceeding Sollicitous for her Safety? . . .
2. Who is it they pretend the Church is in Danger from? . . .
3. What is the Church in Danger of?

All very detached and judicial, but two numbers later (19th July), referring to an attack upon Marlborough as an enemy to the Church, the tone is warmer, partisan, scornful:

Really, Gentlemen [we note the confidential 'Gentlemen'], you must have the most Scoundrel Thoughts of the Peoples Sences that read your Papers, to think of prevailing upon them to read this Stuff.

The retort contemptuous: but in the next number, feeling his readers to be on his side, he assumes a bantering tone:

Never was there Equal Danger, never a time of such Unaccountable Distress of the Church of *England*; the *Protestant Religion*, of which the Church of England is the principal Bullwork, is at the last Gasp, is at the Brink of Destruction.

Well, Gentlemen, and what is the Matter?—Truly Matter enough, and Reason enough: Why, the Matter is, the Duke of *Marlborough* has beat the *French*. *Hinc illae Lachrymae*.

Then, soon after, having got his readers exactly where he wants them, ready for any jape from him, he solemnly mounts a High-Anglican pulpit to deliver an orotund discourse:

When alas, from the Deepest part of the Bottomless Pit, from the Darkest Corner of Darkness it self, even without the Agency of *Satan* him self, *who we thought was of another Side*, meerly *self-born*, and produced from a *Fortuitous Conjunction* of Wicked atooms, up started a New Favourite; which being Adorned with Counterfeit Beauties, Painted with Borrow'd Features, and Dress'd up like an Angel of Light, has Debauched the Best of the Churches sons; nay, has, to our Unspeakable Sorrow Infected the Churches Royal Daughter her self, and supplanted all the Zeal and Resolution for the Church which we had built our Hopes upon, and in which our Prospect of Success was Grounded.

But one must not go on too long in this strain, and the next moment the bubble is suddenly ruinously pricked with the next comment: 'The Nick-Name of this Phantom, is wickedly call'd Moderation'. Sheer rhetorical skill could hardly go farther than that: and again, how plain the words, how far from simple the management of them, even apart from the use of irony!

Irony, that most dangerous of rhetorical figures (as Charles Lamb pointed out), which Defoe was always too prone to use: for even towards the end of Queen Anne's reign, as though he had forgotten the bitter lesson taught him by the fate which overtook him as a result of *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, he again got into trouble by, as he thought, absurdly overstating, and thus making ridiculous, the case for the Pretender. I shall quote from one of these, not to

illustrate the irony, but as a sample of another manner, which was, to be sure, to prepare the way for irony, but which for us indicates the progress he was making towards bending prose to his use in recording actual life. I do not feel that any of the prose I have quoted so far is what you might call 'demotic', for only a man who was something of a man of letters could have written those passages. But here, in what I am going to read, he seems to me to be approaching the common everyday speech of the ordinary man. The piece, an argument for the Hanoverian succession, is called *Reasons Against the Succession of the House of Hanover*, and was published in 1713. It opens thus:

What Strife is here among you all? And what a Noise about who shall or shall not be King, *the Lord knows when!*

After a little it goes on:

Why, the Strife is gotten into your Kitchens, your Parlours, your Shops, your Counting-houses, nay, into your very Beds. You Gentlefolks, if you please to listen to your Cook-maids and Footmen in your Kitchens, you shall hear them scolding, and swearing, and scratching, and fighting among themselves; and when you think the Noise is about the Beef and the Pudding, the Dish water or the Kitchen-stuff, alas you are mistaken; the Feud is about the more mighty Affairs of the Government, and who is for the Protestant Succession, and who for the Pretender.

The paragraph goes on for a while in this spirited scoffing manner, to end with:

If the Chamber-maid is a Slattern, and does not please, hang her, she is a jade; or, I warrant, she is a High-flier; or, *on the other side*, I warrant she is a Whig: I never knew one of that sort good for any thing in my Life. Nay, go up to your very Bed-Chambers, and even in Bed, the Man and Wife shall quarrel about it. People! People! what will become of you at this rate?

That is the voice of almost anyone, anyone, that is, with vigour and vitality enough. It is abundantly plain, and apparently simple; but that it was natural, and not the effect of art, one may well doubt. Defoe, we are induced to think, was feeling his way towards demotic speech, and he was to go farther along this path in his first great conduct-book, *The Family Instructor*, of which the first part was published in 1715. This is in dialogue form, one which Defoe had to apologize for using. For, after all, was not this a kind of fiction? And fiction, being lying, was repugnant to the nonconformist conscience. In a later dialogue of 1722, *Religious Courtship*, he pleads that 'Historical Dialogues, it must be confess'd, have a very taking Elegancy in them'. *The Family Instructor*, certainly, proved very taking: it ran into ten editions within five years, a second part being added in 1718. The dialogues, however, or dramatic scenes as they might often be called, are flanked, at the one end by introductions, at the other by commentaries, which are in a very different style. Moreover, there is a Preface, from which I would now take a sample. He is describing the Father, who figures in what might almost be called an embryo novel:

The Father represented here, appears knowing enough, but seems to be one of those professing Christians who acknowledge God in their Mouths, *but taking no effectual Care* to honour him in their Practice; that live in a Round of Religion, as a thing of course; have not the Power of Godliness, nor much

of the Form; a kind of Negative Christian, a *God-I-thank-thee* Pharisee, sound in knowledge, but negligent in Conversation; Orthodox in Opinion, but Heterodox in Practice; and that I have found out such a Person, is to signifie, that let him be *where* he will, and *who* he will, this Work is calculated to reprove and admonish him.

A few years later Robinson Crusoe was to reflect seriously upon the Negative Christian, but that person is not our interest at the moment. What is striking in that passage is the use so skilfully made of the balanced antithetical clauses with their contrasting vowel-sounds and varied consonants: 'sound in knowledge, but negligent in Conversation; Orthodox in Opinion, but Heterodox in Practice'. That is written for the serious-minded. But the dialogues themselves, designed perhaps for reading aloud in the family, are altogether different. And though it may be that *The Family Instructor* seems tedious to the general reader, it is of enormous interest to any student of Defoe, whether to interpret his nature, or as exhibiting him feeling his way towards the novel.

Let us look at it for a moment. The Father, finding from talking to him that his infant son is totally ignorant of religion, scarcely knowing what 'God' means, realizes that not he alone, but also his wife, have been 'negative Christians'. Immediate reform is indicated. No more driving in the park after church on Sundays; no idle visiting, card-playing, nor, worst of crimes, theatre-going. But how will their elder children take this—the daughter of 18, the son about to go out into the world? Not unnaturally they rebel. The son defies his father; the daughter, when lectured by her mother, hums a tune from the last opera—on a Sunday too!—and gets her ears boxed. (Luckily the second son and daughter respond with exemplary docility.) Here is the whole substance of a novel, which is developed in a series of duologues between members of the family, in a way and in a tone which make us think of the novels of Miss Compton-Burnett. Let us overhear the elder brother and sister, where she has been telling him of their mother forbidding her to sally out on Sundays.

SISTER. . . . she struck me, which she never did in all her Life before, and then read me a long Lecture of the Sabbath-Day, and being against her Conscience, and *I know not what*, things that I never heard her talk of in my Life before; I don't know what ails her to be in such a Humour.

BROTHER. Conscience! *What does my Mother mean by that!* Why, have we not gone every Sunday to the Park, and my Mother always gone with us! what, is it against her Conscience now, and never was against her Conscience before! *that's all Nonsense*; I'll warrant you I'll go, for all the Bustle you make about it.

SISTER. I'd go with all my Heart, but *I tell you* she is in such a Passion you had better let her alone, it will but make her worse.

BROTHER. *Prethee don't tell me*, I will go to the Park if the Devil stood at the Door; what, shan't I have the Liberty to go out when I please! *Sure I am past a Boy, a'n't I!* . . .

SISTER. Come, Brother, we had better let it alone *for once*, my Mother will be better condition'd another time, *I hope this will be over*.

BROTHER. Nay, I don't care, *come let's read a Book then*: Have you never a Play here? Come, I'll read a Play to you.

SISTER. Ay, what will you have?

BROTHER. Any thing. (*She runs to her closet for a Play-book, and finds her Plays, Novels, Song-books, and others of the kind taken all away.*)

SISTER. O Thieves! Thieves! I am robb'd!

BROTHER. Robb'd! What do you mean, sister?

SISTER. All my Books are gone! they are all gone! all stole! I ha'n't a Book left! (*Here you may suppose her taking God's Name in vain very much, and in a great Passion.*)

BROTHER. What! all your Books!

SISTER. Every one, that are good for any thing, here's nothing but a Bible, and an old foolish Book about Religion, *I don't know what.* (*Her Brother looks.*)

BROTHER. I think as you say, they are all gone! No, hold, here's a Prayer Book, and here's the *Practice of Piety*; and here's the *Whole Duty of Man*.

SISTER. Prethee what signifie them to me? But all my fine Books are gone: I had a good Collection of Plays, all the *French* novels, all the modern Poets, *Boileau, Dacier*, and a great many more.

In a later duologue the brother tells the sister about what the Father said to him.

SISTER. Well, and what does the *Good Reformer* preach! I suppos it is much the same with what I had from my Mother . . . [and after some more] Well, but what is the Sum of the Matter? What is the course we are to take?

BROTHER. I know not in the least, I have heard a great deal of Stuff of reforming the Family, living after a new Fashion, serving God, and *I know not what*: I wonder *who* my Father thinks we have been serving all this while?

Not all the duologues are so lively, phrased in such realistic vernacular as this one is, with such a perfect catching of the tone of voice, as the story develops itself very much as a novel, with many fairly subtle twists and turns. The elder son, alas! comes to a bad end, but the elder daughter is in the long-run reformed.

What is quite clear is that Defoe was not talking in his own voice; it is not *his* style that we are listening to here. He is beginning to acquire that really astonishing capacity, the capacity that makes a creative genius, for imagining himself so much into the being of his creations, that he speaks with their very accents. Or was he quite consciously imitating their speech? With Defoe one never knows. He is altogether a most baffling character.

A year after the second part of *The Family Instructor*, 1718, another kind of conduct-book, as he would have wished us to regard it, came from his pen, beginning with *Robinson Crusoe*, and going on with *Captain Singleton*, *Moll Flanders*, *Colonel Jacque*, and *The Fortunate Mistress*. It is these that most people know, read and re-read, and that they think of when they talk of Defoe's 'plain and simple style'. Of course, they are plain and simple in style; they are the autobiographies of plain and simple people, especially *Moll Flanders*, whose style, Defoe confesses, he had to improve upon a little. But let us look at the language of two of them, *Crusoe* and *Moll*. Are they the same? It would seem worth while to inquire into the matter, so here is an average piece of *Crusoe*, followed by an average piece of *Moll Flanders* and, to play absolutely fair, as I hope, they are what might be called parallel passages, where each is considering their position. First *Robinson Crusoe*:

I had now brought my State of Life to be much easier in it self than it was at first, and much easier to my Mind as well as to my Body. I frequently sat down to my Meat with Thankfulness, and admir'd the Hand of God's Providence, which had thus spread my Table in the Wilderness. I learn'd to look more up on the bright Side of my Condition, and less upon the dark

Side; and to consider what I enjoy'd, rather than what I wanted; and this gave me sometimes much secret Comforts, that I cannot express them; and which I take Notice of here, to put those discontented People in Mind of it, who cannot enjoy comfortably what God has given them; because they see and covet something that he has not given them: All our Discontents about what we want, appear'd to me to spring from the Want of Thankfulness for what we have.

That is rather stately prose, what you might expect of a man who thinks in general terms, something of a philosopher, who can look outside himself. Now here is Moll Flanders, also looking upon her condition in life.

This was doubtless the happy Minute, when if I had hearken'd to the blessed hint, from whatsoever Hand it came, I had still a cast for an easie Life; but my Fate was otherwise determin'd; the busie Devil that drew me in had too fast hold of me to let me go back; but as Poverty brought me in, so Avarice kept me in, till there was no going back; as for the Arguments which my Reason dictated for perswading me to lay down, Avarice stept in and said, go on, you have had very good luck, go on, till you have gotten Four or Five Hundred Pound, and then you shall leave off, and then you may live easie without working at all.

That is good prose, but it is not stately; it has a more running rhythm. Where free of her editor's obvious betterings, it is more monosyllabic. It is not easy to lay one's finger exactly upon the point of difference; but does it not seem absurd to suppose that Moll Flanders could have written what Crusoe records? And is it likely that Crusoe would have used the words, adopted the run of phrase that Moll Flanders does? It seems to me that Defoe was trying to write, and nearly always did write, in precisely the way his self-confessing characters would have written. Hers is really demotic, and may have served the late Joyce Cary when he wrote the autobiography of Sara in *Herself Surprised*. Very plain, if by plainness we mean easy to understand, and as simple, that is to say straightforward and unadorned, as was called for by the medium employed. Even so, is it the same sort of simplicity as Bunyan's, who really seems all the time to be talking in his own voice?

But let us listen to Defoe talking in his own voice. His own? The term slipped out merely to make a distinction between Defoe speaking for himself directly, and Defoe adopting a *persona*. And what is his 'own voice' but that of a man who is heir to many generations of considered prose, formed largely on a Ciceronian model, flowing but decorated, stressing the meaning by repetition in slightly different words, generating emphasis by bringing in several considerations, varying the impact of the sentence, increasing the effect by the sheer music of vowel sounds. Here is a passage from one of his longest moralistic works, the one on the use and abuse of marriage (1727). The subject, however, is a side-issue so far as this extract is concerned.

National Mistakes, vulgar Errors, and even a general Practice, have been reform'd by a just Satyr.

I would call attention here to the triple structure, which I have elsewhere called

the waltz-measure of English prose, which is repeated at the end of this short passage. Let me begin again.

National Mistakes, vulgar Errors, and even a general Practice, have been reform'd by a just Satyr. None of our Countrymen have been known to boast of being *True-Born Englishmen*, or so much as use the Word as a Title or Appellation ever since a late Satyr upon that National Folly was publish'd, tho' almost Forty* Years ago. Nothing was more frequent in our mouths *before* that, nothing so universally Blush'd for and laugh'd at *since*. The Time, I believe, is yet to come, that any Author printed it, or that any Man of Sense spoke it in earnest; whereas before you had it in the best Writers, and in the most florid Speeches, before the most august Assemblies, upon the most solemn Occasions.

Is that style any more plain or simple than that, say, of *Areopagitica*, saving the famous passages of organ music, which are poetry rather than prose?

Let me now quote from another moralistic work, *The Political History of the Devil*, 1726, taking a passage from the second part, the Modern History.

And this brings me directly to the Point in hand (*viz.*) the State of that Hell which we ought to have in view when we speak of the *Devil* as in *Hell*: this is the very Hell, which is the Torment of the *Devil*; in short, the *Devil* is in Hell, and Hell is in the *Devil*: he is fill'd with this unquenchable Fire, he is expel'd the Place of Glory, banish'd from the Regions of Light, Absence from the Life of all Beautitude is his Curse, Despair is the reigning Passion in his Mind, and all the little Constituent Parts of his Torment, such as Rage, Envy, Malice and Jealousy are consolidated in this, to make his Misery compleat, (*viz.*) the Duration of it all, the Eternity of his Condition; that he is without Hope, without Redemption, without Recovery.

That, surely, brings an echo, not very faint at that, of a sermon by John Donne, whom nobody has ever labelled as plain or simple. Only a man very much alive to what he was doing could write 'without hope, without redemption, without recovery'. That is certainly not demotic writing, and however eagerly those who regard such writing as an ideal (referring contemptuously to 'fine writing') may point to Defoe as their champion, one is forced to the conclusion that he loved words for their own sake, and not merely as mechanical implements; that he rolled them round on his tongue, and found, in Bagehot's phrase, that they were good to eat. I would offer as a presumption in favour of this view the concluding lines of a splendid paragraph in Crusoe's *Visions of the Angelick World*, where he soars into the empyrean, describing the Newtonian universe in a passage at least as good as Addison's on the same subject (*Spectator* 565) and which vies almost with Bishop Berkeley's.

. . . above and beyond, and on every side you see innumerable Suns, and attending on them Planets, Satellites, and inferior Lights proper to their respective Systems, and all moving in their subordinate Circumstances, without the least Confusion, with glorious Light, and Splendour inconceivable.

It is, I suggest, more than a little misleading to take what Defoe said in an often quoted passage from *The Compleat English Tradesman* (1727) thus:

If any man was to aske me, what I would suppose to be a perfect stile,

* 'Thirty' would have been more accurate.

or language, I would answer, that in which a man speaking to five hundred people, of all common or various capacities, [ideots and lunaticks excepted,] should be understood by them all [in the same manner with one another and] in the same sense which the speaker is expected to be understood [this would certainly be a most perfect stile]. (1732 *ed.*)

That is a little wordy, as the editors of 1738 were aware, since they cut out three redundant phrases*. Defoe did not say that this was a perfect style for any purpose or for every audience; as he states, he is here laying down rules for 'The Trading Style'. All he was doing was to repeat his earlier precept that the language must be suitable to the manner of the story, or, as we would say, appropriate to the subject-matter. And whatever Defoe wrote, whether for politics, trade, or religion, whether of occultism, piracy, or the curing of deaf-mutes, whether he was describing a voyage, an event during the plague, or the mental processes of an old reprobate, his language was always fitting, though sometimes barbed with a point that might easily not prick if the sentence was too rapidly read. In my view, one of the most perfect things in its kind is the conclusion to *The History of the Kentish Petition* (1701), which I wish I could read in full. It is superbly assured, yet it is persuasive rather than dogmatic; it ostensibly appeals to reason, but succeeds in stirring the passions. It is wonderfully subtle; only a man who had studied the general mind could have written it; it is an extraordinarily effective political pamphlet. A few extracts must suffice, beginning with the opening of the conclusion.

Had this Nation listened to the Calls of their own Reason, and to the Voice of things, all this Confusion of Councils had been prevented; had the People of England chosen Men of Honesty and of Peaceable Principles, Men of Candour, disengag'd from Interest and Design, that had nothing before them but the Benefit of their Country, the Safety of Religion, and the Interest of Europe, all this had been avoided; they would never have Imprison'd Five Honest Gentlemen for coming to meet them with the Sence of their Country in a peaceable Petition . . .

The next paragraph opens with a little, half-concealed, barb:

All the Advice I can pretend to my fellow Slaves, and Country-men, is that they would not be backward to let the Gentlemen know, that the Nation is sensible they are not doing their Duty.

Rather more than half-way through, the seemingly calm reasoning attains a kind of dramatic tension. He is talking very temperately, in a level tone, about the right to petition. It is all very cool; then almost suddenly the temperature rises to a burning indignation:

But because this Right unlimited, might be tumultuous and uneasie, therefore the Method how he shall do it, is circumscrib'd for decency-sake, that it shall be done by Petition, and that Petition shall be presented so and so, and by such a Number and no more: [very cool, we observe: and then] but that it should be lawful to Petition, no Tribunal, no Court, no Collective or Representative Body of Men in the World ever refused it; nay, the *Inquisition of Spain* does not forbid it, the *Divan* of the *Turks* allows it, and I believe if *Sathan* him self kept his Court in publick he would not prohibit it.

* Those enclosed within square brackets in the quotation.

Here again we get the waltz, the triple construction, with the ends of the clauses varied: 'not forbid it'; 'allows it'; 'not prohibit it'.

Moll Flanders would certainly not have written like that; it is doubtful if Crusoe could have, at least not the Crusoe of 'The Strange and Surprising Adventures'. But he might well have written this from *An Humble Proposal to the People of England for the Increase of their Trade*, 1729:

Why does not *England* enlarge and encourage the Commerce of the Coast of *Guinea*? plant, and fortify, and establish such possessions there as other Nations have done (the *Portuguese* for example) on the opposite Coast in the same Latitude? Is it not all owing to the most unaccountable Indolence and Neglect? What hinders but that we might long e'er now have had strong Towns, and an inhabited District round them, and an Hundred Thousand Christians dwelling at large in that country, as the *Portuguese* have now at Melinda in the same Latitude, on the Eastern Coast?

Crusoe, I still maintain, might have written that, though not, I think, Moll Flanders. Crusoe, emphatically, knew how to make his language suitable to the manner of the story; and when he is cogitating within himself as he does in the Third Part, the *Serious Reflections*, his prose style, evidently, is markedly different from that which he uses when telling the story of his wreck, and his sojourn on the desert island. He is, one is tempted to think, speaking in Defoe's natural voice. Here, for instance, about religious persecution:

In a word, to unchain the Wills of Men, set their Inclinations free, that their Reason may be at Liberty to influence their Understandings, and that they may have the Faith of Christ preach'd to them; whether they will hear or forbear, I say, as above, is no Part of the Question, let the Christian doctrine, and its spiritual Enemies alone to struggle about that: I am for dealing with the Temporalities of the Devil, and deposing that human Power which is arm'd in Behalf of obstinate Ignorance, and resolute to keep out the Light of Religion from the Mind.

That is passably tortuous; but here, from the *Angelick World*, is something even tougher:

As our Propensity to Evil rather than Good, is a Testimony to the original Depravity of human Nature; so the Harmony between the Inclination and the Occasion is a Testimony which leaves the Presence of the evil Spirit with us out of the Question.

I must confess that I do not find that prose very winning; it is certainly not plain, nor very simple, though, when thought about, the meaning is evident. But I should like to conclude my quotations, illustrating the immense variety of Defoe's prose, with a favourite passage of mine from the *Serious Reflections*, which seems to me full of grace, tremulous with moving cadences.

What are the Sorrows of other Men to us? And what their Joy? Something we may be touch'd indeed with, by the Power of Sympathy, and a secret Turn of the Affections; but all the solid Reflection is directed to our selves. Our Meditations are all Solitude in Perfection; our Passions are all exercised in Retirement; we love, we hate, we covet, we enjoy, all in Privacy and Solitude: All that we communicate of those Things to any other, is but for their Assistance in the Pursuit of our Desires; the End is at Home; the Enjoyment,

the Contemplation, is all Solitude and Retirement; 'tis for our selves we enjoy,
and for our selves we suffer.

If that, with the antithetical clauses, the variations in pace, the modulations of tone, is not the work of a conscious stylist, then inspiration has a great deal to its credit. And it is, I think, doubly moving to us, because we sense through it the appeal of an essentially lonely man, a man who after his ruin, his imprisonment, his pillorying, felt himself cast out of normal, happy society, and whose life had been anxious and harried as he busied himself ceaselessly in affairs, pursued by malignant misrepresentation. That, however, is by the way.

The point I have wished to make this afternoon is that Defoe's style cannot be perfunctorily bundled into the category of 'plain and simple'; as though that covered all the prose manifestations of this miraculously endowed man. Plain he nearly always was, but his simplicity is, as Aitken long ago suggested, only apparent. It is carefully engineered, and no more spontaneous than Wordsworth's enormously worked-over expression of powerful emotions. Defoe could write prose in a dozen styles, some of which I have tried to illustrate. But there are many that I have not touched upon, such as that of the *Voyages*, varied within itself, as notably in *Captain Singleton*, if that may be classed with the *Voyages*; or in the *Tour*.

Thus I should like to offer this tribute to Daniel Defoe in celebrating the tercentenary of his birth, adding one more achievement to those many that we rightly credit to this 'almost titanic genius'. Admittedly master of the plain simple style, I submit that, if not *master* in other styles, his skill in these other manners is at no despicable level, which it would be no bad thing for his successors in journalism to emulate.

DISCUSSION

THE CHAIRMAN: I could wish for only one thing this afternoon: that Defoe could be present to hear this discussion, because I am quite sure that he thought of himself as a literary artist and that during his entire active career he had known no criticism of significance. As a young boy studying in Newington Green at the Reverend Charles Morton's academy, he had first-rate teaching from a very great teacher, but for fifty years, from his youthful meditations to his last writing at his death, there was never a single time that he had significant criticism. He had many admirers, people who praised what he did, agreed with what he said; he had detractors like Swift who referred to the 'illiterate fellow, I have forgot his name'; but for a creative artist to work for fifty years without criticism was a great handicap.

Professor Dobrée has agreed to answer questions. I will begin by asking one myself. Professor Dobrée, could you remark on this: Defoe actually excelled in very short writings such as *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* or *The Apparition of Mrs. Veal*, his novels are shorter than those of most novelists of comparable fame, and yet he has the reputation of being a diffuse writer. How could it be that anybody could think of him as diffuse when he actually used very few words?

THE LECTURER: Well, I wonder if the same people who say that he excelled in short writing would say he was diffuse. He was both. He did excel in short writing, when he used very few words. He could also use a great many words, as I hope I have illustrated this afternoon. You cannot say that *The Political History of the Devil* is a short work, nor *The Family Instructor*. As far as his novels are concerned, I do not think they are as short as all that, though shorter, of course, than *Clarissa*. I think

this shows his immense variety. You have two different points of view, and it depends what Defoe you have been reading lately and whether you have forgotten what he wrote before!

MR. P. K. SHAHANI: Many people think that Defoe's writings have made their greatest impact on two divergent groups, analytical economists and motiveless murderers.

THE LECTURER: Well, I have met casually one or two analytical economists, but motiveless murderers are not in my acquaintance. I think the economists have learnt an awful lot from his writings on communal trade and expansion and so on. As to motiveless murderers—you mean things like *Jack Sheppard* and that kind of thing?

MR. SHAHANI: I have in mind the murder of Lord William Russell by his butler, who said that he was motivated because he read *Jack Sheppard*; and also an inter-war case, when a man murdered his wife. It was stated that he had read *Jack Sheppard*, and that had induced him to murder his wife.

THE LECTURER: I did not know about that. There was more than one account of *Jack Sheppard*; Defoe was not the only one to write about him.

THE CHAIRMAN: Defoe wrote two lives of *Jack Sheppard*.

THE LECTURER: Yes, he did. Which life do you think was influencing the murderers? I do not believe they were motiveless!

MR. DEREK STANFORD: Would you say, Professor, that Defoe is a founder of the English ghost story? I know something of the English ghost story in the nineteenth century, but practically nothing of it in the eighteenth or the seventeenth centuries. Would you say that *The Apparition of Mrs. Veal* is a significant work in that genre?

THE LECTURER: Well, the ghost story goes back a good deal farther, doesn't it? There is a ghost in *Hamlet*. Defoe was certainly extremely interested in the occult, he was always hearing voices. Robinson Crusoe said he heard voices, and as you know, Moll Flanders heard voices.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, if you agree with me that Professor Dobrée has given us a very delightful lecture I wish you would join with me in telling him so.

The vote of thanks to the Lecturer was carried with acclamation.

MR. OSWALD P. MILNE (Chairman of Council of the Society): I am sure you would not wish to leave the room after the interesting lecture we have heard without recording a vote of thanks to Dr. Moore who has presided this afternoon. I often feel that if you want to know something about the great Englishmen, about English history, or about an English family, you had better ask an American, and this afternoon Dr. Moore has proved that this is true, for he is a great authority on Defoe and his times and we are delighted and pleased to have had him here on this occasion.

The vote of thanks to the Chairman was carried with acclamation, and the meeting then ended.

THE CRISIS OF URBAN ENGLAND

The Alfred Bossom Lecture by

LIONEL BRETT, M.A., F.R.I.B.A., F.I.L.A., Dist. T.P.,

delivered to the Society on Wednesday, 1st June, 1960,

with the Rt. Honble. Lord Bossom, LL.D., F.R.I.B.A.,

J.P., a Vice-President of the Society, in the Chair

THE CHAIRMAN: This question of urban development is probably one of the most important of our internal problems. Several years ago in the House of Commons, I asked how many congested areas there were in London. The Minister said about nine. Think what has happened since those days. Many of the areas that were then free or which had two-, three- or four-storey buildings at most, now have very much larger buildings, structures accommodating many more people; so that whereas formerly you had four, five or six people coming out of a house, you now have about twenty. In addition to that a great number of very large buildings are projected, a great number are actually building—all of them putting more people on to the roads. And when you realize that to-day there are one thousand nine hundred new cars more on the roads every day in Great Britain, you can quite understand the magnitude of this problem. So I am not going to stand between you and this very interesting paper, which I have already had the privilege of reading.

The following lecture was then delivered.

THE LECTURE

Thirty-four years ago this summer the C.P.R.E. came into existence, with the late Lord Crawford as its President, Sir Guy Dawber as Chairman and Professor Patrick Abercrombie as Hon. Secretary. Mr. Herbert Griffin was the Secretary, as Sir Herbert is to this day. It was 1926. The speculative builders were at their busiest; the country was still littered with abandoned war works; town-and-country planning in its present universal sense was non-existent; advertising was uncontrolled, ancient buildings and trees were unprotected and English architecture (I think one can confidently say) was at an all-time low. Le Corbusier's villa at Garches was building, but the first modern house had not been seen in England, and the last great classical house, Lutyens's Gledstone, had been finished three years before. At this moment of frantic and feckless boom, and of despair in the tiny minority that had eyes to see, the C.P.R.E. set out to rescue rural England from what Clough Williams Ellis called 'the Octopus'.

Well, as we all know, there is no C.P.U.E., and very little sign of a similar movement of opinion coming to the rescue of our towns and cities in their hour of need.

The reasons are plain. For a century now, enlightened opinion has turned its back on them. To the poets, they were the Cities of Dreadful Night, satanic, filthy, corrupt, and I remember being struck by a newspaper article in the '30s, which transferred these epithets from Coketown to the brand-new nightmare landscape of the Great West Road—that was before the word Subtopia was

invented. The blight seemed to be spreading too fast ever to be controllable, and the ironical thing was that in the rush to get away we allowed vast new areas of countryside to be submerged by builders as cynical and thoughtless as those who created the slums we were trying to get away from. To the reformers, the only cure was escape, to ever-increasing distances—first to Hampstead Garden Suburb, to Bourneville, to Saltaire, then to Letchworth and Speke and Wythenshaw and Dagenham, then to the first ring of New Towns. You put a *cordon sanitaire* or green belt round the stinking city and tried to do something better beyond it. Now we have the L.C.C. invading Hampshire, and Glasgow repopulating the Eastern Highlands. I am not saying that all this has been a mistake, only that our best minds have been concentrated on decentralization for a hundred years. It is hardly surprising that public opinion has taken the hint, and tests your social status by how far out you can afford to live. Liking urban life is the mark of a fast-vanishing working class and the fad of a tiny intellectual minority.

These social pressures alone made it unlikely that the cities would find many friends. Moreover, whereas the English countryside was there, a living masterpiece, that seemed to need no treatment more complicated than preservation, the cities were manifestly already spoiled and changing all the time. Preserving what exists is obviously easier, and suits the British temperament better, than trying to think out ways of controlling evolution. Powerful interests wanted to protect the Sussex Downs and supported the C.P.R.E.; equally powerful interests (occasionally the same ones) wanted to knock down Berkeley Square. Cities after all owed their existence and their growth to such interests, and the mere money cost of interfering with them was daunting. Visionary wartime plans for London such as the Royal Academy's at one end of the architectural scale and the MARS Group's at the other were laughed out of court by the economists. To this day, the L.C.C. has to pay for a new roundabout by cluttering it up with monster office buildings.

And yet, despite all these discouragements, an obstinate affection for the towns most of us live in persists in us. I need not speak here of London, centre of our world and, to anyone who was brought up here, evocative of our whole lifetime in a hundred ways. But even our blackest provincial cities, suffering deeply from residential escapism and the consequent blight of their inner rings, buried in miles of subtopia, fighting to preserve their cultural life and their best people from the pull of the south-east, even they command a lot of loyalty, and whenever I have got to know one of them, like Newcastle, or Bradford, or Liverpool, I have been astonished by their strength of character. Yet it is no good deluding ourselves. The things we admire in these cities, their neighbourliness, busy-ness, intimacy, convenience, grandeur, which are the basic virtues of an urban environment, are on the way out, with the rest of the Victorian way of life. Snug terraces with walled gardens have been let go too long, until they are beyond conversion, and have to be written off as slums. Sprawl and lack of parking space have made a mockery of the convenience which was the starting-point of town life. As for grandeur, we can no longer afford it, and if we could,



'Just occasionally, a packet of Victorian picture-postcards . . . reminds us of what we have lost'

there is no space to walk about and enjoy it from. For the motor-vehicle has taken command. This is the crisis of urban England, foreseen by some people forty years ago, but like so many dangers, impossible to communicate to most people until the disaster has actually occurred.

Towns change so continuously that it is possible not to realize that the changes that have occurred in the last hundred years have the scale of a disaster. Just occasionally, a packet of Victorian picture postcards, or a visit to some forgotten Scots or Irish market towns, reminds us of what we have lost. I don't propose to rehearse the symptoms, or to recapitulate the diagnosis. I shall assume that everybody in this room is only too familiar with the two-way action of the motor-car, centrifugal in its ability to drop houses down every remotest country lane, centripetal in its insatiable appetite for space at the centre—so that our towns and cities continue to explode into the countryside yet continue to seize up with central congestion. But before I open the medicine chest I think I must refer to one quack remedy: the Los Angeles solution. There must, it is thought, be *some* density low enough for everyone to travel to work in his own car, and that is how we had better live.

Theoretically of course, on a clean slate, it should be possible to stack cars in such a fashion that the walk from parking to office would be tolerable. But not, of course, at anything like present city densities, which would necessitate, for



*'For the motor vehicle has taken command
 the disaster has actually occurred'*

example, demolishing every building in downtown Manhattan and covering the whole area with nine stories of transportation space with the city rebuilt on top of it. 'Cars for all office workers in the square mile of the city of London would require four to five square miles of parking, and that without providing for visitors, deliveries, or movement within the area.'* Making no value judgement, purely pragmatically, our cities and towns exist—a greater investment than all the rest of our national wealth put together. They cannot be written off, and they cannot be rebuilt to give every worker a car park. This makes it unnecessary even to think of the visual effect on them, or of the huge areas of countryside that would be eaten up. But like all over-simplifications, the idea of a levelling or give-and-take of densities has, as we shall see, its own contribution to make to the final solution.

I am going to divide the obviously many-sided solution into three heavy-sounding Latin words,

Transportation,
 Internal Decentralization,
 Migration,

and since we are on the subject, I take transport first, the most glaring, though not the most fundamental, deficiency of our towns and cities as they now are.

* Reifenberg.



[Gordon Fraser Gallery]

'The things which we admire in our cities . . . are on the way out, with the rest of the Victorian way of life'

Transport means of course the mechanisms in which we carry ourselves and our goods and not the road or rail they travel on, and it is worth remembering that changes in these mechanisms (for example miniature taxis) or in the use made of them (for example, taxation designed to force heavy goods on to the railways and canals) are the first and simplest way of relieving the pressure. Public transport carries 90 per cent of urban workers, and anything we can do to make it less pathetically and even cruelly inadequate for its peak-hour load must be done. I have often been struck by the speed with which a great works employing say 20,000 people clears its day shift, compared with the desperate slowness with which Mayfair, employing a similar number, empties itself on a wet winter's night. New equipment and a ruthlessly tidal use of it are the first stage.

The next stage is regulatory—in other words the more efficient use of the roads and railways we have. Considering our situation, we seem to have been extraordinarily sleepy and dilatory about this, so much so that our Minister of Transport makes headline news when he goes abroad and sees things like longitudinal white lines, prohibition against turning into oncoming traffic, pedestrian control, police towaways, synchronized traffic lights, all of which have been familiar there for fifteen years. We seem to make heavy weather of our problems with a multiplicity of little signs and symbols, but are only serious about getting the traffic moving when there is a big sporting occasion or a tube strike.

On parking, a vast subject in itself, I will say two things only. The first thing is that the meters in London have shown the efficacy of *reducing* parking provision, and that conversely there is a real risk in *increasing* underground and multi-storey car parks of overloading the streets on to which they give—as Mr. Seymer has shown in a recent article in the *Architects' Journal*. The second thing is that the worst parking problem is not in the cities but in the country towns, where people really do have to shop by car and where the scale of buildings and spaces is so small that parked cars completely dominate the scene.

Lastly, there is new construction. Here I only have time to say that the guiding principle is, of course, segregation. This country is about midway between America and India in the degree to which it allows its roads to be cluttered up with horsed vehicles, handcarts, circuses, gigantic parts of ships, bicyclists, and of course desperate pedestrians—human beings in their natural form.

Segregation can take two forms, horizontal and vertical. Horizontal segregation produces precincts like Burlington Arcade, the Inns of Court, the shopping centres of the New Towns—delightful, but limited in application, since vehicles have to creep in to service them, and you can only reach them by crossing floods of traffic which the existence of precincts obviously intensifies. Until we have adequate main arteries we cannot, as we should like to, create many residential precincts in our great cities.

Vertical segregation, with all its difficulties and costs, is undoubtedly the final answer. It too, roughly speaking, can take two forms: elevated motorways or elevated footways. In areas that cannot be totally rebuilt, elevated motorways are inevitable, and Brussels has shown how quickly you can run them up. But our cities have few existing streets wide and straight enough to take them, and once they start intersecting and over-riding the existing pattern they can become as destructive of human values and land values as were the elevated railways in South London. On the other hand, in the hands of imaginative planners, they could be the chief agents of urban renewal in our blighted areas. Completely derelict areas, areas designated for comprehensive redevelopment, such as the Barbican, bring us to the second form of vertical segregation—elevated footways or what we call podium planning, with shops and all pedestrian entrances and facilities at first floor level. This is nowadays considered the ideal pattern, but unfortunately we cannot have a patchwork of both systems, and before we go too far with either we must make up our minds (as London apparently has not yet done) which we want. Maybe the ultimate will be a three-tier system with parking and servicing at the bottom, pedestrians in the middle, and fast motorways above. One thing is certain. Whatever channels we do provide will immediately be in spate, and if costs are to stay within bounds at all we shall have to look at the problem not only in terms of supply, but also of demand. Can we, in other words, lessen the *need* for these stupendous works? This is clearly a question not of engineering but of planning, and brings me to my second heading: *Internal Decentralization*.

The main trouble in all our cities and towns is strangulation of the heart. In some cases, like London, Bristol, Glasgow, Newcastle, this is because the

city grew up at a point where a tidal river could be bridged, and points have no area. Other towns started from minute beginnings as villages and are still trying to make do with the village street. Only a handful like York and Canterbury have the ready-made inner ring that continental towns got from their fortifications. The natural way for towns to grow is radially, along the roads that radiate from the centre, and this is sensible enough, though it produces still more congestion until motorways are fitted in between the spokes of the wheel. But nobody has given a thought to the expansion of the heart or core. All that has been attempted, at great cost, has been an inner ring road, still based on the idea that the wheel is the inevitable framework. This helps to sort out the traffic at the centre. It does nothing to reduce it.

It is obvious that if the business centres of cities and towns continue to grow outwards into residential areas, just as the towns themselves grow outwards into the country, there will be no decrease but probably an increase in central congestion. The only hope is to freeze them at their present size and to create new centres in the suburbs. And by this, I don't mean merely or mainly shopping centres but the big office buildings which are the main traffic generators. The L.C.C. has seen this, but alarmingly late in the day, and not before areas like Holborn, Westminster and Knightsbridge (not to mention the City) have been tragically over-built. Among country towns, Hertford saw it before the war, and so did Oxford, but for various reasons Oxford did not act in time.

The location of these new centres and their distance from the original centre must vary in each place. In the case of London, the ideal locations are the old suburban centres like Holloway and Ealing, which are to have the traffic drained out of them by new motorways and are in any case badly in need of renewal. They should generally be not less than five miles from Charing Cross, and should be linked with one another by motorway and by a circular tube or monorail, so that commuters can reach any of them from any outer residential area by a single change.

But this is not the end of the story. These groups of skyscrapers must be the nuclei of what SPUR calls 'New Towns within Cities'. If they are rightly sited, they will lead to (and incidentally pay for) the renewal of the most dingy and depressing of the ancient boroughs and villages which the Victorian expansion of London engulfed and corrupted. And of course one would hope to see this done at a truly urban density, with the kind of mixed development of high flats and terrace houses that the L.C.C. has a world-wide reputation for. Cities like Glasgow and Coventry and Sheffield are nowadays not far behind.

The result, in terms of densities, in terms of traffic and in terms of land values, would be a range of smaller peaks instead of a single colossal pyramid. The centre would still of course be the largest. Government, Law, the City, perhaps the Theatres, would still be concentrated there, and the smartest shops must inevitably be allowed to hang together there—must, in fact, be given rather more space there. And the provincial equivalent of these institutions would also, in the main, stay put—otherwise the centres would lose their point. But the great aim would be to spread the load, and to cope with one's own overspill by

major concentrations of building in what is now suburbia, carefully sited astride the radial railways but aside from the radial motorways. Diagrammatically the idea is perfectly simple.

I spoke a moment ago of taking care of one's own overspill, and in terms of local authority housing I believe internal decentralization could do it. But unfortunately that isn't the whole of the problem. There is natural growth. There is immigration. A big employment concentration at Ealing would certainly encourage more people to try to live in the at present carefully protected Chilterns, and we must face the possibility, if we explode their centres, of exploding the cities as well. There is wild talk of a continuous city from London to Liverpool. I believe myself that this situation can be controlled, if we care enough to do it. This brings me to my last main heading: *Migration*.

We can now see that the main error of the New Towns was that they were in fact (though not in name) satellites. They circled the conurbations like the moons of Jupiter, and were administratively linked with their parent planets in schemes for the decentralization of industry and population. The obvious danger, that they would be caught by their parents' gravitational field and finally absorbed, now looms very close. For a nation that has founded great cities all over the globe this seems pretty unambitious, and of course it did nothing to stop the drift of population to the south-east or to adjust the regional balance of the country as a whole. Picked off the map, towns like Hereford or Louth or Dumfries look the sort of places that could happily have taken half a million population each, with its employment. Or if such small beginnings are not feasible economically, old industrial areas like Tees-side and South Wales are well placed to grow into new cities of that size. Nothing closer to the big conurbations will be any real relief in the long run to their problem of congestion. And it seems pretty clear that only migration on that scale, and to those sorts of distances, can prevent the eventual running-together of the great conurbations on the London-Birmingham-Liverpool axis, as each link with the motorway spawns its inevitable dormitory.

That a paper concerned initially with urban amenities should get mixed up with regional planning was, I'm afraid, inevitable these days, since urban amenity implies de-congestion and de-congestion involves 'where-to?' And what of the tools for the job? They are rusty from disuse, rather than non-existent. Even to make an inventory of them nowadays produces a yawn. Research, for instance, to see what sense the obvious ideas I have put to you make physically, financially, sociologically. Even in the war, when we had other things to think about, the Ministry of Town and Country Planning had a first-class research department, yet nowadays, far more prosperous, the Government skimps this most rewarding of all forms of investment, and the scale on which the charitable trusts and the universities can finance it is quite inadequate. Regional planning, another yawn, advocated through the years by everybody interested in the subject, now presumably awaits decision on local government boundaries. But the most critical problems, and those which need the earliest start on research and experiment, are those of urban renewal itself.

In a mixed economy like ours it is clear that private and public agencies each have something to contribute to the redevelopment of our towns and cities. The problem for the economist and the politician is the familiar one of diverting as much as may be of the vast profits to be made out of the easy areas to help finance the difficult ones, without overdoing it and putting private enterprise completely off its stride. Even so, nobody imagines that urban renewal can be self-supporting. The difficult areas greatly outnumber the easy ones, and finally the only thing that will see us through is a national realization that this country, which got rich partly by running up the most obscene and disgraceful slums in Europe, has a duty to put some of that money into rebuilding them. We shall need a national urban renewal agency to work out techniques and as a start to finance a full-scale pilot project in some deserving city. We shall need local Reconstruction Committees to fight for this cause against the many other calls on local finance and enthusiasm. And we shall need the existing Civic Societies, led by the Civic Trust, to muster public opinion and to interest people in the looks, the personality, of the places they live in.

You may think all this very abstract and remote from the realities of your own local community, where the problem is probably the quite simple one that it is cheaper to use the market place as a car park than to buy up land for a car park behind the scenes. Sir Herbert Manzoni, the distinguished president of the Civil Engineers, has described architects as having a typical Opposition mentality, engineers being of course the Government and so having to speak more responsibly. For this view of them, architects have only themselves to thank—or blame. All the same, you will remember that John Stuart Mill said that ‘improvement in human affairs is wholly the work of the uncontented characters’. The vital thing is that we should be uncontented, not merely when we are stuck in a traffic block, but when we see the ancient and human-sized public spaces of our towns turned into traffic circuses or stuffed to the brim with pressed steel. The job of our generation is to restore these spaces to the human being on foot. At the moment water out of the moat is running straight through the drawing-room, as at Oxford. But in most of our towns the drawing-room is still there, and a day will come when flagstones will again run from wall to wall of our medieval streets and you will emerge from them into quiet squares. It is not too late. Nothing irremediable has happened, or to be accurate and remembering where we now are, irremediable things haven’t happened everywhere. We know the technique now, and the rest is entirely a matter of will.

One thing we should be crystal clear about. The right way to renew cities is not necessarily to delete large areas and rebuild them *de novo*. The result—not the final result, since there is no finality in this process—the result at any given moment will never be better than a patchwork. The right way is for old and new to co-exist like the cells of a living organism, the best of the old given new life by painting and planting, and the new embracing it, contrasting with it, setting it off.

Preservation equals renewal. That is the basic truth, as true of cities and towns as it is of woodlands and gardens. It doesn’t mean wholesale destruction and



[Crawley Development Corporation

*'We know the technique now, and
the rest is entirely a matter of will'*

a fresh start. It needs an eye for what is sound, an eye for what is odd, off-beat, peculiar to the place, a sense of scale and human needs, and above all the courage to search for and put to work the best ideas of our own time. This is not a bad period architecturally; in fact, it is the first for a long time when one has felt that the ability exists to make every change a change for the better. If we can tuck away the motor car in the various ways I have suggested, I believe we shall find the effect on our spirits quite breathtaking, and feel that at last, at long last, our urban environment has turned the corner.

I said at the beginning of this lecture that there is no C.P.U.E. or Council for the Preservation of Urban England. I have tried to show that that isn't exactly what we need. There is S.P.U.R., the Society for the Promotion of Urban Renewal, and it would be wrong of me to sit down without acknowledging my debt to my colleagues in that society. The essence of what I have tried to put to

you is that no single clever idea will win this battle. In terms of 1944, we must be Eisenhower-men, not Montgomery-men. And that means attacking all along the line.

DISCUSSION

MR. P. K. SHAHANI: Could the lecturer tell us how far the Royal Academy's and the MARS Group's plans are still valid? There seems to be only one city in the whole world which has realistically coped with this problem of motor cars, and that is Fort Worth in Texas. Could Mr. Brett tell us of the usefulness of any of the experiments there?

THE LECTURER: It depends on what you mean by validity. I think that the Royal Academy's plan is invalid in the sense that it did not picture the traffic problem with which we now have to contend. The MARS Group's plan is invalid in the sense that it involved a degree of demolition and rebuilding which was unrealistic. I do not think that they now have anything but historic interest.

Fort Worth, I am afraid, is equally a matter of history because although it is right theoretically, it too (I believe) is not being carried out. A perfect picture was produced for one middle-western American city which showed how a typical grid-iron type plan, with the usual down-town area, could be transformed into a city having a social space in the centre and a ring of car parks within a reasonable walking distance of that central space. Whether it is carried out or not I do not think is of very great importance to us here; the point is that while it was theoretically correct, it depended on people walking. One of the things that we must realize is that we have got to learn to walk again. We shall not be able to drive to where we want to shop or eat in big cities any longer.

MR. MAX LOCK, F.R.I.B.A., M.T.P.I.: I have just recently come back from Brazil, where discussions on Brasilia have taken place, and there the tendency seems to be the reverse from what it is here. They say 'Why can't we have an M.1 type of motorway between Rio and Sao Paulo for instance, instead of spending all our money on roads to places where nobody has yet seen Western Civilization?' There are two types of motorway, the relief motorway as in the example of M.1, and 'the development' motorway. The relief motorway tends to be a magnet collecting a population into an area already full. The development motorway is planned to give access to areas which require an injection of industry and population. To what extent could such a system of motorways be helpful in rehabilitating places like Louth, Hereford, Dumfries? This is the first question.

The idea of a green belt is a concept which has grown up from the earliest Utopias onwards. Ebenezer Howard's conception of the Garden City is logical for a stabilized city but it never anticipated the impact of the car on the growth of towns. Does Mr. Brett consider the green belt an organic device in relation to the modern growth of towns? It seems to me that the star-shaped or finger-shaped type of plan, as exemplified for example in Copenhagen, permitting green wedges to penetrate into the heart of the town, enables the town to extend in a more natural manner. Is the controlled linear extension of cities along their own service arteries a more sensible approach to the problem of growth than development in concentric rings restricted by a green belt?

My last point is this. How can we get urbanity in our suburbs when we can only choose between slums and 'Subtopia'? How can we do it without a very drastic revision of our Bye-laws which now insist on such impracticable space standards? Streets seventy feet wide, for example, and the universal idea of two-storey houses. How can we bring the opinions of the architects and other people to bear on the authorities who are responsible for Bye-laws, which insist on the kind of planning which even the best designer in the world cannot overcome? I am afraid these are big questions.

THE LECTURER: How very clever of Mr. Lock to put what he has said in the form of questions, because of course he has answered them himself! I cannot add very much to what he has said, and in any case the scale of his questions is vast. As far as these two kinds of motorways are concerned, it is perfectly true that the M.1 is a bypass; it is a relief road to cope with an existing situation and the danger is that it is liable to become the backbone of a city a hundred miles long. That of course can be prevented by strong-minded planning by the County Planning Authorities, and there is no particular reason why we should be defeatist, but it is not in any sense a development road; as Mr. Lock has said, it does not help us to redistribute our population.

If what we need are new cities rather than new towns, it is clear that communications are the first necessity. I am terrified of talking in these terms because of the investment involved, but when I think of a country like Brazil, which is well known to be virtually bankrupt, and of what it seems to be able to do, I wonder where our money goes, and why we can so seldom afford anything we require in this country.

As to the plan of Copenhagen, it seems to me that the reason why it creates the effect of a hand is that it is on the coast. If it happened to be inland it would just be a radial form of development like any other. But you must link the fingers, so that it is possible for people travelling from any part of the catchment area of a great city to work in any of its outer suburbs. At the moment, if you are thinking of establishing an office in London you have got to put it in the West End or in the Centre simply because that is where all the communications converge.

As to the Bye-laws, I agree with Mr. Lock that they inhibit originality of layout and development. The new towns have not been subject to these Bye-laws; or at any rate, if they have, they seem to have managed to circumvent them to some extent, and yet it is disappointing that so far even they have not succeeded in doing anything as original as one would have liked. I think everyone recognizes now that the kind of rule that says that houses must be seventy feet apart is unscientific, and that proposals must be judged on their merits. The waiver of an existing Bye-law is really more important than the Bye-law itself. Provided one can get such waivers, and provided one is allowed to put one's case on its merits, it is still possible in this country to do things which are nonconformist.

MR. P. W. PECK, A.M.T.P.I.: If I heard Mr. Brett correctly, he envisaged, as one part of his frontal attack on the problem of urban England, that as many as half a million people might be transmigrated to places like Hereford, Dumfries and Louth. I wonder if he would care to say how he imagines that in each of such places, beautiful old country towns, half a million inhabitants could just be welded on? Must we jettison Hereford and Dumfries as they are to-day, and merely build a new city in their place?

THE LECTURER: To my mind there is no better centre for a great city than the nucleus of a cathedral town, which is in many cases the ideal pedestrian precinct. I do not think the difficulty of great developments of this kind is an aesthetic one. The difficulty is an economic one. It is a question of getting industry to move those distances. I have no idea whether in fact those three places have the communications that would enable industry to move such distances; that is why I qualified by saying that of course there is also South Wales and Teeside, where such communications do exist. I do not think that anybody ought to take those three places very seriously. I gave them as an illustration of distance.

The essence of the problem, and one which I think ought to be seriously considered, is whether we *can* establish new cities out in the blue. What are the difficulties? Can we possibly think of decentralization on that scale and not on the satellite scale which we have seen hitherto?

MR. J. A. CARPENTER: Could Mr. Brett follow what he has just said by supplementing his statement about the need for public relations? Lanchester, right at the end of

The Art of Town Planning, says: 'The main reason why we have so little beauty in our cities is not that the capacity to produce this is lacking but that so few among us realize that there is any real necessity for us to possess this quality.' And that is just as true to-day as it was a generation ago.

Talking of technical expertness, the architectural profession's ability to offer solutions far outstrips the public consciousness of the need for them. How in fact are we to achieve the necessary powers—for substantial legislation would be needed to establish large provincial cities at this distance from London—unless we can convince Parliament and the public that this is a good thing? Although the Civic Trust and various other societies no doubt carry on their advocacy, will it not take so long that any measure of the size required reaches the Statute book too late, is delayed too long to be of service in countering this particular problem?

THE LECTURER: Is planning possible in a democracy? That is the question you are asking, and it remains to be seen whether it is. In America (where there isn't any planning in the sense of which I am speaking) conurbations on a scale which we simply cannot take in this country have already occurred: from Washington to Boston is virtually one great megalopolis. The question is whether a democracy is capable of stopping that, or whether only a dictatorship can do these things. I do not believe that public opinion is going to do it. I do not believe in public opinion; I believe in the opinion of a small number of people, and the question is whether we can convert this small number to a realization of this danger before it is too late to do anything about it. That is the object of this kind of lecture, the object of the existence of one or two societies and groups that are trying to work in this field. Your question is really the basic question—are people going to take any notice? Well that is really up to everybody in this room.

MR. R. D. GENTLE: Don't you think it possible that in the next fifteen years the helicopter to a large extent may replace the motor car? And if it does, will not that to a certain degree solve the problems of transport in cities?

THE LECTURER: We have often dreamed of those little things which you put on your shoulder like a rucksack and which enable you to pedal about in the sky! I am not a scientist, but an architect. I have not the foggiest notion whether there is any future in this. I should have thought that if it was practicable it would have happened by now. I think that in fact we have got to reckon with the motor car for a long time to come, and that the roads could be the means of vast improvements in our cities. We must not be sentimental about our cities, most of which are unspeakably depressing. We have here the need for vast public works—there is no getting away from it—and the great thing is that we should exploit that need in a creative spirit and not sit back and wait for something to turn up.

MR. T. C. FOLEY (Pedestrians' Association): Does the lecturer think we should consider more restrictions on the use of the private car in large cities, and ensure that the vast majority of people who want to move about (except, say, doctors and other important people) do so in public transport? Otherwise does the lecturer not think that the development of cities will be dictated by this vast increase of private cars?

THE LECTURER: I agree about public transport. Anyone who has to motor past a 'bus queue on a wet November night is appalled at this great deficiency in our civilization. When everything else is working pretty well, and people's standard of living is now pretty good, to see the faces of people waiting in a 'bus queue is to realize that our public transport is a most miserable performance. I do not myself believe in restrictions on private motor cars because I believe they are self-correcting. When congestion reaches a certain point, people give up. This is why the problem of public transport is absolutely basic in London and in all our big cities.

MR. NOEL MOFFETT: I have been very interested in what Mr. Brett has had to say about the motor car. I admire his courage in facing up to the problem, which seems to me an enormous one, but I cannot agree with him that the answer is the creation of new large cities in various parts of the country. Our cities are historically interesting and we must preserve them.

I think Mr. Brett's ideas could be applied, with reservations, equally well to existing cities. I would refer back to Professor Abercrombie, whose ideas about traffic were already out of date when he formed them in 1943. I do not think he foresaw the formidable problem we are facing to-day, but his ideas about the precincts of London were essentially sound. He said that London was not a city but a collection of precincts, and that each precinct has its own individuality, its own atmosphere, and its own character, and that if planners would think of cities in that light they would be better able to solve the problems involved, including that of the motor car. Would Mr. Brett agree that if we are to have giant motorways carrying large numbers of cars, then these motorways might be split into, say, three-lane ribbons raised above our heads, with each ribbon carrying a different type of traffic? They would not be an eyesore if they were well designed. They would not in any way limit the movement of ground traffic, slow-moving traffic or pedestrians. They could flow in between the precincts; then the problem of preserving the city, and at the same time of making it possible to drive through it and into it, would merely resolve itself into clearing out the areas between these precincts.

If you look carefully at the map of London, you find that portions are already decayed. Hackney is being rebuilt, Shoreditch is being rebuilt, Poplar is being rebuilt, but the no-man's-land in between belongs to nobody and nobody is apparently happy with it. Surely we could clear it away slowly and make it into a park; then the motor roads, even giant ones, carrying a large volume of traffic, would flow between the precincts and underneath would be this park. It would be interesting to hear Mr. Brett's opinion of such an idea.

THE LECTURER: To take the second point first: what you say is, I think, accepted policy. The only point is that we have got to be careful where we put these motorways because their scale is colossal, and it is going to be quite difficult in an old city to find a line for them which is not going to damage existing townscape.

Now I come back to the first point. I am not saying that we should just establish new cities and forget or ignore the old ones. We have to realize that we have not begun to deal with the expansion of our cities. If we are not to allow our cities to explode like American ones, we shall have to move many people right out, and the object of this is of course to enable us to keep our existing cities civilized and under control and to do the things that you suggest to them. The two things go together. I am saying that we cannot get away from decentralization or what I call migration, that the existing boundaries are going to burst unless we provide an outlet in some direction, and I think the outlet has got to be migration rather than satellite towns.

MAJOR G. B. J. ATHOE: When I was going to Montreal some years ago, a dear old lady said, 'If you happen to be near Vancouver, do give my nephew my love'. When I pointed out that I should have to go about three thousand miles to do so, she adopted a different attitude! We are dealing in this country with what in my boyhood days used to be called a tight little island. The urgent question seems to be congestion, especially in London and some of the larger cities, and I submit that most town planners think too much of the private motorist. Now where I live in town there is a solid and continuous mile of traffic accumulating along the main road between four and six o'clock p.m. I stood there one night and counted cars as they were coming through, and saw that in most cases they held one person, or if it was not one person then it was a single passenger in a chauffeur-driven car. The chauffeur could be much better employed, and the passenger could have got on a 'bus. To-day

you have the Derby. I do not know whether you could get a fifty-four to one chance on any horse, but you can on public transport; and we have, I think, as good a service of public transport in this country as anywhere in the world, if it is used properly. Fifty-four people can get on a 'bus, and I think of that when I see these streams of private cars coming along, holding up the 'buses, commercial vehicles, doctors and similar people who must carry on.

The more public garages you build the more you are going to encourage this private motor traffic on the roads. As for the motorways, I quite agree with Mr. Brett that they are going to lead to one long vista of houses, resulting in more and worse congestion. How can you avoid congestion? My suggestion is that unless people coming to town have a special permit, they should not be allowed into town with a private motor car because they could leave it outside. There are places outside and around London and other large cities where they could park their cars and then they could board a train and come to town. Also, there are plenty of facilities for travel by 'bus, tube or taxi.

THE LECTURER: I think we must beware of having a down on any particular kind of transport. This whole problem is capable of scientific analysis and scientific solution. You must not garage more cars in a city than there is room on the roads for. But I do not think it is any good taking a restrictive view. I believe we in this country are only in the infancy of traffic planning, and I am sure that it is possible to arrive at a solution without having a down on the private motorist. The fact is that if a person in a large car with a chauffeur cannot get where he wants because of the congestion he himself is causing, he will soon pick some other means of transport. The thing is to some extent self-corrective, but it can only work if the roads are there.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have learnt from Mr. Brett's attitude that he agrees (and so does everybody else who has thought about it) that we must have a lot more research, a lot more knowledge of the actual facts of the situation. We know the painful result; we do not know the cause, and we have not really taken the trouble to find out. For example, transport engineers are not very common in this country—there are a few; about fifty-nine, I believe—but in the States a transport engineer is required, as a sanitary inspector is, by every community, and they have certainly helped themselves in many ways. There is one other point that is not always realized here. People have to pay a tax for a motor vehicle, they have to pay for the petrol they use, and in those ways they pay something over four hundred million pounds per year. At the present time we are only spending something like sixty million a year in development of our thoroughfares. I think there has got to be less disparity between those two figures, because what we are going to have to do is going to cost an awful lot of money.

Now I am sure we all want to thank Mr. Brett very much for his stimulating paper.

The vote of thanks to the Lecturer was carried with acclamation, and the meeting then ended.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN FIJI

The Henry Morley Lecture by

SIR ALAN BURNS, G.C.M.G.,

*delivered to the Commonwealth Section of the Society on
Thursday, 26th May, 1960, with the Rt. Honble. The Earl
of Perth, P.C., Minister of State for Colonial Affairs,
in the Chair*

THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Alan Burns is an old colleague and friend of many present here, and all of us know some of the great things he has done in the past. Before I came here I asked exactly where he had visited when he was in the Colonial Office overseas service, and as far as I could see he had been in every part of the globe, except, perhaps, in the Pacific; so it was especially appropriate that he should be asked to head the mission which went out to study the problems of Fiji. To be a little bit more specific, Sir Alan was Governor in British Honduras and then went to the Gold Coast. The first time that I had the pleasure of meeting him was at the celebrations for Ghana's Independence. But he is known perhaps best of all for the (nearly) ten years which he spent as the United Kingdom representative at the United Nations. His work there, I think, was of outstanding importance. Whereas before our Colonial policy was generally thought of as pretty unattractive or bad in various ways, by the time he finished at the United Nations I think everybody realized that our policy and what it stands for, Colonialism, was good. There is a great debt of gratitude owing to him for that.

The following lecture, which was illustrated with lantern slides, was then delivered.

THE LECTURE

I am going to speak to you this afternoon about the Colony of Fiji, and I do so with some diffidence because of my slight knowledge of the place. I have always had a horror, which I am sure you all share, of the man who poses as an authority on a country on the strength of a short visit. I am not an authority on Fiji, and if I venture to speak about it at all it is only because of the exceptional opportunities I had of learning something of its problems when I was there last year as chairman of a Commission of Enquiry.

I was fortunate in having two very competent colleagues, one an agriculturist with long tropical experience, and the other a well-known economist. Through the eyes of these highly qualified men, I was able to see many things which might have escaped me if I had depended on my eyes alone.

I was also able to read a number of official reports, and more than 600 notes of evidence submitted to the Commission by people of all races and classes. The Commission visited all the important centres in the Colony, and had discussions with many of the inhabitants.

The first thing to remember about Fiji is that it is about as far from this country as it is possible to be, exactly twelve hours in time. The 180th meridian passes

through the colony, but, although for most of its length this meridian serves as the international date line, there is a kink in the date line which places the whole colony to the westward of it.

I was told a story in Fiji of what happened before this arrangement was made. One enterprising shopkeeper maintained that the meridian passed through the middle of his shop, so that when it was Sunday at one end of the shop it was Saturday or Monday at the other end. In this way he was able to evade the law regarding Sunday trading, and to keep open for business seven days a week.

There are over 300 islands in the group, the two largest, Viti Levu and Vanua Levu, containing over 87 per cent of the total area of the colony. The smallest island would not be much larger than this room. All the larger islands and most of the smaller ones are mountainous, and of volcanic origin. The windward sides of the islands have a very heavy rainfall, but the leeward sides, sheltered by the high mountains, are comparatively dry. I was in Suva, the capital, which is on the windward side of Viti Levu, during the so-called dry season: it rained almost every day.

The total population of the colony is about 375,000. To take the immigrant races first, there are some 6,000 Europeans, some of them settlers whose families have been there for three or four generations, but most of them from Australia or New Zealand, working as missionaries, business men and officials, and residing in Fiji for only a few years. Then there are about 8,000 part-Europeans, as they are called, mainly descended from European fathers and Fijian mothers. There are, again, about 4,000 Chinese, mostly engaged in trade or market gardening, and five or six thousand persons from other Pacific islands—Samoa, Tonga, the Gilbert and Ellice and the Solomon Islands. Finally, there are about 170,000 Indians, who to-day represent 49 per cent of the total population. Most of these are descended from persons who were brought from India as indentured labourers between the years 1879 and 1916. They came to work in the sugar-cane fields, and most of the Indians still do so. The labourers were offered repatriation to India at the expiry of their indentures, but very few took advantage of the offer. At least 92 per cent of the Indians now in Fiji were born in the colony and have no other home. They have contributed largely to the economy of Fiji, and many of them, starting from scratch, have reached good positions commercially and in the professions.

I turn now to the original inhabitants of the colony, the Fijians, who now number less than 43 per cent of the total population, some 6 per cent less than the Indians. They are a charming people, but for several reasons, to which I will refer later, they are finding it difficult to compete with those of other races under modern conditions. They are seriously alarmed by the rapid growth of the Indian population, which already exceeds their own, and by the economic superiority of the Indians. It was largely for this reason that so many of them recommended to the Commission that all the Indians should be deported from Fiji. Quite apart from the practical difficulties of such an operation the Commission felt unable, on grounds of humanity, to give the proposal serious consideration.

The population problem is, however, a serious one. The Commission was in

fact appointed to examine the population trends in connection with the natural resources of the colony, and many witnesses assured us that Fiji was already overpopulated. This I do not agree with, but there is no doubt that with the rapidly falling death rate, and a very rapidly rising birth rate, the population, and especially the Indian population, is increasing at an alarming pace. It is estimated that eight years from now it will be 500,000, and that by the year 2000 it will be between 1,200,000 and 1,400,000.

Unless production increases very materially during the next few years, Fiji will be in a serious position. It has been the business of our Commission to suggest ways in which production could be increased to keep pace with the growing population, and to point out some of the causes of the apparent stagnation in economic development.

The most important of these causes is the land problem. Before the Cession of Fiji to the British Crown in 1874, a considerable amount of the best coastal land had been sold by the Fijian owners to Europeans, at what to-day would be considered ridiculously low prices. Many Fijian witnesses referred to what they called the 'illegality' of the way these lands were acquired, in exchange, as they said, for 'smoking-pipes, blankets, muskets, and whisky'.

After the Cession, the colonial government set up a commission to inquire into the titles to these lands, and some of the alleged titles were disallowed, but for the rest the legal title was fully recognized. Some of these lands are held by descendants of the original grantees, and others have passed by sale to other owners, including some 75,000 acres now held by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, an Australian corporation and the most important business institution in the colony. The present owners could hardly now be dispossessed, after some eighty years of undisputed occupation.

The Deed of Cession of 1874 was referred to by one witness as 'our Fiji Magna Carta', and it is undoubtedly so regarded by all Fijians. I shall read you the most important of its paragraphs, number 4.

That the absolute proprietorship of all lands, not shown to be now alienated, so as to have become *bona fide* the property of Europeans or other foreigners or not now in the actual use or occupation of some chief or tribe, or not actually required for the probable future support and maintenance of some chief or tribe, shall be and is hereby declared to be vested in Her Majesty, her heirs and successors.

There are two particular points in this paragraph to which I would invite your attention. In the first place, the alienation of land to Europeans, to which I have already referred, was explicitly recognized by the chiefs who signed the Deed of Cession. The second point is that all land needed by the Fijians, then or in the future, other than Crown Land and land already alienated, was reserved for Fijian use.

The Fijians were the original inhabitants and owners of the land, and at the time of the Cession there were few people of any other race in the colony. Indian immigration did not begin until 1879, and for some years was on a small scale. Apart, however, from the terms of the Deed of Cession, repeated assurances

have been given by Governors and other British officials that all the land in Fiji, other than Crown Land and freeholds, was recognized as belonging to the Fijian people.

Whether these assurances were wise or not, I personally do not consider that they can be set aside because conditions have changed since they were first given. The Indians, on the other hand, maintain that conditions are now so different, with the Fijians comprising less than half of the population, that the promises and assurances given them in 1874 and subsequently should no longer be held binding, and that the land should be divided fairly between all races.

While I do not agree with this argument, I must admit to some sympathy for the Indian point of view. The Indians have practically no land, and have to pay rent to Fijians, or to European freeholders, for such lands as they are allowed to, occupy and cultivate. They are given only short leases in respect of such lands and these short leases are not conducive to good farming.

The position has been made still more difficult by the policy declared, some twenty years ago, of instituting reserves of land for the use of Fijians, which could not be leased to anyone. The idea was that land outside these reserves should be leased to Indians and others, the rents for these leases going to the Fijians. The delay in delimiting these reserves (still very far from completion) has caused for many years uncertainty and frustration. As former leases expired they were either cancelled altogether or allowed to continue on an annual basis. Or, if the previously leased land was incorporated in a reserve, the former Indian cultivator was expelled, and, in many cases, the land remained unused, generally reverting to bush. There are, in fact, considerable areas of Fijian land which are completely unused, and the dog-in-the-manger attitude of the Fijians over their land is naturally resented by the Indians.

So also is the attitude of some of the European freeholders who do not make proper use of all their land, and yet are unwilling to dispose of it, or lease it, except at high prices.

To meet these difficulties the Commission has recommended the imposition of heavy taxation on unused land, and that much longer leases should be issued than now exist. Without in any way impugning the ownership of land by Fijians or freeholders, we have recommended steps to ensure that the proper use of the land should not be unreasonably prevented.

I referred just now to the considerable areas of Fijian land that are unused, and this can be attributed, in a large degree, to the Fijian system of land tenure. The Fijian land is communally owned by family units (*matagali*), but to a large extent its use and cultivation are controlled by the Fijian Administration, to which I will refer later. Under the rules of this Administration the people are told what to plant and when to plant it. There is a prescribed programme of work, and the village head announces in the evening the next day's planting or harvesting programme, and names the members of the village told off for various tasks. It is possible for an individual to contract out of his communal obligations and become an individual farmer, but there are obstacles to any such display of initiative.

Perhaps, however, the most serious obstacle to all Fijian development is the custom of *kerekere*, which allows a Fijian to demand from his relatives any of their possessions. The successful independent farmer, or the successful Fijian in any business, is a prey to his less energetic or jealous relatives, and there is little inducement to make or save money which can be *kerekered* away so easily.

I heard of a young man who worked for some time on an agricultural training farm, and, when he left, had earned about £80. Two months later he came back to borrow money with which to start a farm, explaining that all he had previously earned had been taken from him by his relatives and spent on a prolonged feast.

The Fijians love parties and feasts, and much time and money are wasted on them. Cattle provided to start a stock farm rapidly disappear, eaten at one or other of their ceremonial feasts. As I have said, the Fijians are a charming people, but their carelessness with money, their apparent incapacity for sustained effort, and above all their customs, make it difficult for them to compete with others.

In most countries, customs change with the years, allowing people to adapt themselves to changing conditions. This is, unfortunately, not the case in Fiji, where the customs have been maintained, or perhaps I should say petrified, by legal sanctions. The individual Fijian has been deprived of any opportunity for initiative and discouraged from striking out on his own.

He is not allowed to live away from his village without permission; he is bound by regulations to carry out the orders of his chiefs as to what he should plant and where he should plant it; he is compelled to leave anything else he may be doing in order to co-operate with other villagers in building or rebuilding houses, again by order of the chief; he is bound to provide food and make other preparations for ceremonial receptions to his own chiefs or distinguished visitors. It has been argued that he enjoys these ceremonies and the feasting that accompanies them. Of course, he does; we all enjoy parties, but the Fijian has too many of them and sacrifices everything to them.

It is through what is known as the Fijian Administration that these regulations are made and enforced. This Administration, under the Secretary for Fijian Affairs, was originally intended to be a form of local government, but it is far more racial than local as it deals only with Fijians, even in those areas where Indians are in the majority. It has, in fact, become almost a separate government, parallel to the central colonial government and to some extent independent of it.

The members of the Fijian Administration, other than the Secretary for Fijian Affairs, are all Fijians, and its executive organ is the Fijian Affairs Board, manned entirely by Fijian members of the Legislative Council. These members are chosen by the Chiefs and are not elected.

Apart from the unnecessary expense of a dual administration, the present arrangement leaves too much power in the hands of men who are not democratically elected, and perpetuates the division between the Fijians and those of other races who inhabit the colony. It also keeps alive those Fijian customs which, as I have tried to show you, have had such an unfortunate effect on Fijian enterprise.

The Commission has recommended that the Fijian Administration should be replaced by a proper form of local government in which all races should be represented.

The Fijians have been treated in the past, by their chiefs and by the government, as though they were children. They are not children and they are not fools, and I can see no reason why they should be denied the privileges of citizens, and the right, within the law, to live and work as they please. They have been mollycoddled for far too long.

In a way, the Indian population of Fiji has also been mollycoddled, that is to say the large proportion of them who grow sugar-cane. Some years ago the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, which owns all the sugar factories in Fiji, gave up the planting of sugar-cane on their land, and leased this land in ten-acre lots to individual farmers, mostly Indians. The Company buys the cane from these farmers, and grinds it, and then exports the sugar. The Company assists the farmers in various ways, with advice, with fertilizers at cost price, and with advances of money.

This Company has done a great deal for Fiji, and I should like to pay tribute to its efficiency. But to some extent it has deprived the Indian cultivators of any need for initiative. All the cane farmer has to do is to plant the variety of cane which the Company advises, and reap it when he is told to do so. He does not have to worry about financing the growing crop or the marketing of it, and in recent years, owing to the good price he has been getting for his cane, he has been earning good money.

This easy and remunerative crop has made the Indian farmer believe that nothing but sugar-cane is worth growing, but there is a limit, under the Sugar Quota Agreements, to the amount of sugar which Fiji may produce, and this limit has already been reached, and indeed exceeded. There are other crops, notably rice, which could be grown, and much of the present unused land could be used to develop a forest estate and a timber industry, or to grow such tree crops as cocoa and coffee, or be used as pasture, but most farmers are reluctant to undertake the admittedly harder and less remunerative work which these industries would entail.

So when we hear that there is a shortage of land in Fiji what is really meant is that there is a shortage of the rich, level land on which sugar-cane could be grown. There is little inclination to try out new crops, or to work on any but first class land.

I have now dealt with the principal obstacles to development in Fiji, which, I have said, are the land problem and the restrictions on individual effort imposed by Fijian custom.

I have suggested that these obstacles could be overcome by heavy taxation of unused land, by longer leases, and by freeing the Fijians from the burdens imposed by custom. The Commission of Enquiry did not accept the statements commonly made that the population of Fiji is too large, or would soon be too large, for the land available.

Let me mention one striking comparison. The area of Viti Levu, the largest

of the Fiji Islands, is almost the same as that of Jamaica, in the West Indies. Both islands are about the same distance from the equator, Jamaica to the north and Viti Levu to the south of it. Both are liable to hurricanes and earthquakes. The interior of both islands is mountainous. Both produce sugar, bananas and copra. But with all these similarities, the difference in population is remarkable—the population of Jamaica is over one and a half million, while that of Viti Levu is less than a quarter of a million.

The interior of Viti Levu is indeed very rugged, but there are areas which could be cultivated if roads were built to open up the country. The Commission has recommended that large sums should be provided for the construction of roads in both the large islands. There is no reason why cocoa, coffee and tea should not be planted in some of the areas at present unused. There is ample room for beef and dairy ranching. The sea around the islands abounds with fish, yet quantities of canned fish are imported.

Of the established export crops I have already referred to sugar-cane, and explained that owing to the limitation of the quota this valuable crop cannot be expanded. Bananas are grown, chiefly by Fijians, but there is only a limited market in New Zealand and little chance of finding other markets.

On European owned estates, and on land owned by Fijians, coconuts are grown, and copra (with coconut oil) is the second most valuable export from Fiji. There is, however, a serious threat to this crop in the age of the trees. There has been little replanting in recent years, and the Commission has recommended the expenditure of a considerable sum for this purpose. Another threat to the industry lies in the neglect of their plantations by so many owners. There is a story in Fiji that coconut trees say to the farmer: 'If you take care of us for four years we will take care of you for four generations', and to some extent this is true. Once a coconut tree is well established it will continue to produce nuts for a long time, but it will produce more if the undergrowth around it is cleared. The few well-run coconut estates obtain yields of from eight to ten hundredweight of copra per acre, while four to five hundredweight is the maximum obtained from Fijian groves.

I am afraid that the Fijian farmer is not an energetic person, and that communal work, on communally owned land, is evaded whenever possible. At the same time it must be admitted that the Fijians do produce large quantities of ground provisions for local consumption, although they could do a great deal more if there was greater incentive, or, should I say, less disincentive such as *kerekere*.

It is obvious that none of the recommendations made by the Commission of Enquiry, which I have so far mentioned, can have immediate results, except in so far as they may reduce the danger of unemployment. The improvement of communications, the replanting of coconuts, the planting of new tree crops, the development of a fishing industry with perhaps the canning of fish, all these things will give returns, but not for five or six years.

There is, however, one industry which offers quick returns, and that is tourism. The Commission has recommended that assistance should be given to the building of more hotels, and that active steps should be taken to attract tourists. Fiji is

well served by air and shipping. Numbers of tourists go now to Fiji from Australia and New Zealand during the southern winter, and I believe that tourists from the Western United States will go there during the northern winter. Fiji may not offer all the attractions which other tourist resorts may offer, but it has attractions of its own, and I am sure that there is a good future there for tourism.

Time does not permit me to refer at any length to other possible developments. There are minerals in Fiji, but on present information the future of mining is not very bright. The only gold mine in the colony would have to close down (throwing a large number of employees out of work) if it were not receiving a temporary subsidy from the Government. Small manganese mines are moderately successful. Bauxite has been found, but so far not in commercial quantities. There is a little phosphate in one of the eastern islands. The Commission has recommended that the Geological Survey Department should be expanded and that private prospectors should be encouraged.

The essential thing, to my mind, is to encourage agriculture and forestry, and such other industries as will develop and enrich the colony. In the past too high a proportion of government expenditure has been devoted to social services and not enough to economic development. In 1958 about 23 per cent of the total government budget went on medical and education services and only 2½ per cent on agriculture. I fully realize the importance of health and education, but the standards demanded cannot be maintained if the economic development of the country is neglected.

The health services in Fiji are good and it is significant that the death rate is lower than in New Zealand. There is a fairly high percentage of literacy. The standard of living in general compares very favourably with colonies I have known in Africa and the West Indies, and indeed with many independent countries in Asia, but the Fijians and Indians in Fiji will not accept such comparisons. They prefer to compare conditions in the neighbouring countries they know best, Australia and New Zealand, and demand a standard of living as high as in those countries. They will have to work much harder if they are to reach such standards.

In conclusion, let me refer again to the Fijians. Some of you may think that I have been over-critical of them, but I assure you that I have a great admiration for them and believe that they have a great future, if only they are treated as men and not as children. They have certainly proved their manhood. During the last war, against the Japanese, and again in Malaya during the rebellion there, the Fijian troops fought with distinction and gallantry, earning the highest praise from those who saw them in action. A number were decorated for their services, and one valiant Fijian soldier won the Victoria Cross.

They are faced to-day with a situation which was not of their own making, and they have been given little chance to adapt themselves to new conditions. I consider it essential that they should be given all possible assistance.

DISCUSSION

THE CHAIRMAN: I should like to hear a little bit more about *herehere*, which seems to me to be an extraordinary arrangement. Do I understand that if any member of my family owned a bit of money, I could go and say I wanted it, and take it?

THE LECTURER: In effect, yes. I suppose it started in the primitive days when everybody in Fiji had about the same amount of food and clothing and everything else, and so if one man came and asked for a gift of some food his other relatives would get it back one way or the other later on. But to-day, when there are great differences in wealth between one Fijian and another, if a man has made a lot of money in business (it is admittedly not very often that Fijians do that), by becoming an independent farmer, for instance, all his relatives batten on to him, and the poor man just has not a chance of getting on. Anyone is entitled to go to a relative and ask for something, in spite of attempts made by the Fijian Administration to prohibit this. The Fijian has not got the moral courage to refuse demands which are called *herekere*.

SIR HARRY LUKE, K.C.M.G., D.LITT. (formerly Governor of Fiji): May I ask Sir Alan Burns if he would agree that it is mainly because Fiji has become (not by any desire of the Fijian people) a plural community instead of being a single one as it was before the arrival of the Indians, that they have had to be protected until now by their communal system? No doubt the communal system has now become, in certain respects and in consequence of two wars, a hindrance to the urbanized Fijian rather than the protection it was intended to be to the race. But had there not been this system, I venture to suggest that the fate of the Fijians to-day (seeing that they are being inexorably outnumbered by the Indians) might be heading towards that which has overtaken the Hawaiian people, who have had no such protection against the invasion of peoples from other races and other continents. So much so that, except in the remoter Hawaiian Islands, it is difficult to find pure Hawaiians other than the distant member of the Hawaiian Royal Family who is hired by the Americans to shout *aloha* through a megaphone at arriving and departing steamers.

THE LECTURER: I quite agree with Sir Harry Luke that if the Fijians were alone in Fiji the present arrangements would be excellent for them; but through no fault of theirs, they are now less than half the total population, and they cannot hold their own against the immigrant races unless they are prepared for this. The recent Commission of Enquiry recommended that steps should be taken to ensure that Fijians should be able to stand on their own feet, which I am quite sure they can do if they are allowed to. The Fijian is just as good as anybody else.

We had some very distressing evidence given to us from Fijians, however. One Fijian said, 'It is unfair to compare us with other people who are so much ahead of us', and another said, 'We want protection because we are not able to stand against these people by ourselves'. Well, if that is so then there is something seriously wrong, because they are strong, intelligent, fine people, and there is no reason why they should be kept in a sort of zoo separated from the facts of this horrid world. I may say that I have seen exactly the same sort of thing happen in Nigeria. In the northern parts of Nigeria for a very long time people were kept apart from the world, with the result that they are far behind those in the southern parts of Nigeria. I think that is why the Fijian to-day is behind the Indian. If he were given a chance and encouraged to exercise some initiative, I believe he would prove just as good a man as anybody else.

MR. H. MARSHALL (Australia House): May I ask three questions? They may not be within Sir Alan's province, but he may have impressions bearing upon them. The first is, does he have the impression of seeds of future conflict arising out of the attitude towards white settlers in Fiji? Secondly, what does he think of the prospects of independence for Fiji as a separate entity, bearing in mind the accelerated developments along those lines nowadays in Africa in particular? Thirdly, and slightly more facetiously, how does he reconcile tourism, or the prospects of tourism, with that incessant rainfall he mentioned?

THE LECTURER: In the first place, with regard to the feeling against white settlers:

I think the Fijians for many years regarded them as protectors against the Indians, and I think to a certain extent that feeling persists. There was a certain show of hostility to Europeans during the recent riots, but I think that was simply because the European shops happened to be in the particular area where the riot was at its worst, near the market. On the other hand, there is the possibility that the Fijians might combine with the Indians in a general hatred of everybody of fairer complexion; but I do not think that is a very serious possibility at this time.

As regards independence, I do not believe for one moment that the Fijians want to be independent, because they feel that if they were they would have no protection against the Indians who now outnumber them. Some of the Indians—not all—would probably like to be independent because they would control the situation by their numbers. But I do not believe that at the present time it would be in the best interests of the colony to get independence.

As for tourism, the windward side of the island is very rainy indeed; Suva, where I stayed, was on the rainy side; it rained nearly every day; but on the other, leeward, side of the island there is not such heavy rain. In fact, I do not think I saw any rain at all on that side. That is where the tourists would go, I should suppose.

MR. G. E. MERCER (Deputy Secretary, Royal Society of Arts): Would Sir Alan Burns care to say a word about the financial situation? Would the developments which have been recommended be financed by the Fijian Government or would they require loans from outside?

THE LECTURER: Fiji could not possibly pay for some of the developments we have recommended, and so we have also recommended grants and loans amounting to between thirteen and fourteen million pounds. I think this money is absolutely necessary if Fiji is to be developed in the way it should be.

MISS F. ASKHAM ('New Commonwealth'): Why have the Indians multiplied so much more than the Fijians?

THE LECTURER: One reason is that the Indian women begin having children at a much earlier age than the Fijian women. Indians have more children, and they look after them after they are born. Fijian children are brought up more carelessly, and they are not always very successfully reared.

THE CHAIRMAN: Whether, in his own view, Sir Alan Burns is an authority on Fiji or not, it is quite clear that he has told us something extremely interesting. He has given us a clear idea of Fiji and its problems. I could not help thinking, as I listened to him, that there was a good deal here which is going to mean serious work for us at the Colonial Office. Perhaps the final proof of that came when I heard that somehow or other Fiji has got to have thirteen or fourteen million pounds! Well, I can think of a great number of other Colonial territories, with more people, though perhaps with not more pressing problems, who would also like thirteen or fourteen million pounds and a great deal more! I am not saying that Fiji is not a very worthy one in the queue, but that there is a great problem of finance.

My other thought in listening to him was, how constructive has been his mission. The Fijians will not face their own problems, so the Commissioners were asked to try and find out what is to be done and then come out with some answers. So often people go and look and then their answers are not very practical. But it is quite clear to me, though I must confess that I have not yet studied the full report, that Sir Alan Burns' mission has done the most valuable work, and in listening to him this evening I have formed a distinct idea of what has to be done.

It only remains for me to say that when we have heard that the hotels have been built I think everybody in this room sooner or later should go and see about the rainfall and other things! Sir Alan Burns, on behalf of everybody, I wish to thank you very much.

The vote of thanks to the Lecturer was carried with acclamation.

LORD NATHAN, P.C., T.D., F.B.A. (a Member of Council of the Society): Before you move, ladies and gentlemen, I am sure that you will wish to express to Lord Perth your appreciation of his coming here this afternoon to take the Chair. It is always entertaining and interesting on these occasions to have a Minister, so that we may see what sort of a fellow he is. Now I know what sort of a fellow Lord Perth is because I have the chance of sitting opposite to him quite frequently in the House of Lords, and I can tell you that he is most adroit in the way in which he answers Questions, most skilful in the way in which he conducts the difficult and complex affairs of his Department, and that he has, not only in his own right but also by inheritance, a deep sense of public service. That sense of public service is indicated by his presence here to-day. I am sure that you will wish to join with me, speaking as I do on behalf of the Council of the Royal Society of Arts, in thanking him.

The vote of thanks to the Chairman was carried with acclamation, and the meeting then ended.

GENERAL NOTES

PICASSO AT THE TATE

A prodigious body of criticism in many languages has grown up on Picasso's styles of painting, from the precocity of his childhood work in Corunna and Barcelona through his changing scenes of life in Paris, Italy, and the South of France to his recent series of variations on Velazquez's great picture *Las Meninas*, one of Picasso's most sustained labours completed in his villa near Cannes. Before one adds yet another contribution to this criticism, it may be worth considering the swing of popular English taste reflected in the queues of ordinary people now snaking down the steps of the Tate Gallery—a public seemingly much more intrigued than antagonized in the presence of close on three hundred of his paintings.

Undoubtedly the Picasso-Matisse exhibition at the Victoria and Albert soon after the War was a stimulant to very many inquiring students. But Television had not then begun to suggest to its vast captive audience, attentive to Brains Trust and other informative discussions, that the theories of Modern Art might, in fact, be directly related to their own apprehensions as well as to their modern homes and furnishings. Only a dozen years ago popular opinion generally supported the outburst of the late Frank Emanuel, an ardent reactionary artist who created a hostile demonstration at the Picasso-Matisse show. To-day it would seem that instructive TV programmes are affecting popular taste in much the same way that Roger Fry once roused his more cultivated audiences from the lecturer's platform, waking the eye as he analysed the sensations provoked by this and that Post-Impressionist painting.

Of course, it would be foolish to suggest that the unending battle of 'Modern' Art has been completely won, or ever can be won throughout the country. But at least there has never before been so widespread a recognition in every level of society that the revolutionary tendencies in art during the past half century have received a greater stimulus from the ceaseless invention and creativity of Picasso than from anyone else; and the presence of Royalty at this first major retrospective of his painting in London, organized by Mr. Roland Penrose and the Arts Council, has signified honour of the achievement of a *stupor mundi*. At the same time one must remember that Picasso's most significant explorations were carried out in association with Georges Braque. During the heroic years (1909-14) the two friends were working 'rather like mountaineers roped together', as Braque expressed it, on the creation of Cubism. Their aim was to discover a means of representing space and volume without recourse to illusionism. The process by which they came to reject the traditional rules of linear perspective and of modelling in the round, substituting the construction of flat crystalline facets to give a semblance of solid form, is familiar to all students of art history. Confronted with the group of Picassos at the Tate which

includes the *Girl with a Mandolin* from New York, it requires an imaginative effort to realize that these serenely ordered compositions were a step in the dark, a venture entirely into the unknown fifty years ago.

Before that, however—at the end of 1906—Picasso had already to some extent foreshadowed his Cubist discovery with the angular planes and shallow depth of *Les Femmes d'Alger*. Internationally celebrated through reproduction, this painting (lent by the New York Museum of Modern Art) represents a turning-point not only in Picasso's career but also in the history of contemporary art. The very hybrid nature of the huge canvas seems but to reinforce its hypnotic power. The inconsistent stylization of the features of the five figures may be explained by the influence of primitive Iberian sculpture on the left-hand group, and (as Mr. Penrose reminds us) Picasso's subsequent enthusiasm for African masks from the Congo reflected in the sinister couple, presumably painted later, on the right. Throughout this period, the barbaric aspect of his sculptural figures is closely associated with the primitive vitality of African carvings.

The presence of this and other key-works in the artist's development compensates for the absence of *Guernica*, in which all the anguished intensity of his reaction to the ferocity and futility of war is concentrated. There are, nevertheless, related studies here such as the violently distorted horse's head painted a few days after the destruction of *Guernica* by German bombers on 27th April, 1937. This frightful symbol had been used previously in depicting the agony of the bull fight and, with other expressive devices such as the two eyes on the same profile, it recurs in Picasso's mythological language. Of all the moods to which his mercurial art gives expression, brutality—and the despair it engenders—is the one which strikes home with greatest poignancy. We are told how deeply the artist's life and work have been affected by his relationships with his devoted partners and children. But rarely in Picasso's domestic portraiture is the mood other than equivocal, with impishness generally to the fore. Walking through these galleries and remarking the demonstrative agility on every side, it might seem, indeed, as if a rubber face were pulling any number of faces in lightning succession.

Yet every sweeping assertion about this abounding genius has, in the end, to be qualified. No doubt the occasions when tenderness, as opposed to humours, informs his Spanish exhibitionism are most plentiful in his 'Blue' period, and the melancholy of some of those early figures may still touch the heart. At the same time, the criticism made in *The Times* that the one deficient weapon in Picasso's armoury has been a feeling for paint itself must certainly be qualified when one looks, for example, at the succulence of the Tate's painting of a nude in a red armchair, in which colour, substance and handling combine to voluptuous effect. What, at least, is unarguable is that Picasso's output continues to stream like lava from a volcano in continual eruption. And that indeed is a phenomenon to be marvelled at if it touches no deeper chord.

NEVILLE WALLIS

COMPLIMENTARY TICKETS FOR THE FACTORY EQUIPMENT EXHIBITION, 1960

A number of complimentary tickets for the Factory Equipment Exhibition to be held at Bellevue, Manchester, from 21st September to 1st October, 1960, have been made available to Fellows of this Society by courtesy of *The Financial Times*, which is one of the sponsors of the exhibition. Those Fellows who are interested are invited to apply to the Secretary.

'THE DANIELLS IN INDIA'

Under the title 'The Daniells in India', an exhibition of some 100 water-colour drawings of Indian life and scenes by Thomas and William Daniell is on view in the Art Gallery of the Commonwealth Institute until 25th September. The drawings

were made by the Daniells during their tour of India from 1784 to 1794, and so far as is known, so large a selection of them has never before been publicly shown. The exhibition has been arranged by courtesy of the P. & O. Steam Navigation Company, to whom the collection belongs.

CONFERENCE ON 'PLANNING AND THE MOTOR VEHICLE'

The Town and Country Planning Association are holding a national conference at Church House, Westminster, on 18th and 19th October, 1960, on the subject of 'Planning and the Motor Vehicle'. Because of the dominating influence of the national highways system on major land use planning problems and policies, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Transport, Mr. John Hay, has been asked to speak in the first session of the Conference on 'The Planning of the National Road System'. The other speakers will consider the impact of the motor vehicle on the functioning and design of cities, towns and villages, and the trends and likely demands in ownership and use of the motor car. Summaries of the papers to be read will be available before each session, and there will be full opportunity for questions and discussion.

Tickets for the Conference cost £1 10s. each for members of the Association and £2 2s. each for non-members. Application should be made as soon as possible to the Director, Town and Country Planning Association, The Planning Centre, 28 King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.2.

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES: AN INQUIRY

The August issue of *The Manager* contains a paper on the history of English societies before 1800 which was read at a recent conference of the Business Archives Council by the Society's Curator-Librarian. Attached to the paper is a chronological table and a select bibliography.

Unfortunately, space in the table could not be found for mention of the provincial agricultural societies, some of which were modelled on the Society of Arts. A list of such societies whose names are known to the Curator-Librarian is printed below, in the hope that readers of the *Journal* may be able to supplement it with further information for inclusion in a card index of early societies which is being maintained in the Society's Library. (In each case the date of foundation is given, unless otherwise stated.)

ENGLISH LOCAL SOCIETIES FOR THE PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED BEFORE 1800

1767	The Manchester Agricultural Society
1769 fl.	The Doncaster Agricultural Society for the West Riding of the County of York and the County of Nottingham
1772	The Lewes Society for the Encouragement of Agriculture, Manufacture and Industry
1774	The Norfolk Society for the Encouragement of Agriculture
1777	The Society instituted at Bath for the Encouragement of Agriculture, Arts, Manufactures and Commerce
1780 fl.	The Society for the Encouragement of Agriculture in the East Riding of Yorkshire
1783 fl.	The Society for the Encouragement of Husbandry at Odiham
1783	The Society for the Promotion of Industry in the Southern District of the parts of Lindsey in the County of Lincoln
1790 fl.	The Huntingdon Agricultural Society
1790 fl.	The Northamptonshire Agricultural Society
1790	The Shropshire Agricultural Society

1791 fl.	The Durham Agricultural Society
1792	The Worcestershire Agricultural Society
1793 fl.	The Melford Agricultural Society
1793 fl.	The South Devon Agricultural Society
1793	The Cornwall Agricultural Society
1793	The Kent Society for the Encouragement of Agriculture and Industry
1794	The Berkshire Agricultural Society
1794	The Leicestershire Agricultural Society
1797	The Society for the Promotion of Industry in the Hundreds of Ongar and Harlow

STUDIES IN THE SOCIETY'S ARCHIVES XIII

DR. PETER TEMPLEMAN AND HIS APPOINTMENT AS SECRETARY
OF THE SOCIETY IN 1760 (iii)*

Templeman's work for the Society as its Secretary has been well described by Sir Henry Trueman Wood, and in 1958 an account of his work on the proposed 'Historical Register' was published in the *Journal*.¹ The record of his work can be traced in the pages of 'Dr. Templeman's Transactions' and in the other archives of the Society. His only published work during his period of office was a small collection of letters on the culture of lucerne, turnips, burnet, Timothy grass, and fowl meadow grass, containing letters already 'published in the Ledger, and most of them at the request of the Society'.² Some of the published letters are unsigned; others are from Davies Lambe of Ridley, Christopher Baldwin of Battersea, and John Willy of South Petherton. There is also an appendix taken from Mr. Henry Wynne Baker's Report to the Dublin Society of his experiments in agriculture in the year 1765, 'and an account of . . . improved instruments, etc'.³

Very little is known of Dr. Templeman's family life in London. The only references to his wife and daughter known to the author of this note are the mention of his family in his letter and report to the Trustees of the British Museum quoted above,⁴ and the entries recording their burial in the Parish Registers of St. Martin-in-the-Fields.

It is to be hoped that Dr. Templeman had his little family comfortably installed in the house provided for him by the Society in Denmark Court close to the Society's apartments, but neither his wife, Frances, nor his daughter, also named Frances, lived long to enjoy the new home. Mrs. Templeman died on 12th June, 1762, and her daughter in April, 1764.

The health of his wife and daughter perhaps was not robust and we know that Peter Templeman himself suffered greatly from asthma, which finally caused his early death. Nichols gives the following account of this malady,⁵ quoting at the end of it from a letter written by Templeman himself to a friend in 1745.

Very early in life Dr. Templeman was afflicted with severe paroxysms of Asthma which eluded the force of all that his own skill or that of the most eminent physicians then living could suggest to him; and it continued to harrass him till his death which happened on 23rd September, 1769.

In 1745 he mentioned this disorder to a medical friend as returning more violently and frequently than ever, and in regular attacks like an ague. His friends thought him in a galloping consumption; and by their advice he went to Hampstead to drink asses' milk. 'After lodging there', he says, 'to no manner of purpose more than a month, I returned to town, and now began to think I had

* The first and second parts of this article appeared in the issues of the *Journal* for May and July respectively.

nothing else to do but to apply to quackery, and hesitated a little betwixt Ward and the Bishop of Cloyne. I concluded, however, that the first place was due to the Church, and accordingly entered upon *Tar-water*.'

The reference to *Tar-water* and the Bishop of Cloyne is to Bishop George Berkeley⁴ who, while in America, had learned the use of *Tar-water*, and had published a pamphlet on it in Dublin in 1720 (reprinted in England in 1744), and had made it the subject of several later letters and publications, notably *Siris* (1744). The 'Ward' referred to is Joshua Ward, nicknamed 'Spot', a quack-doctor, fashionable and famous for his widely popular 'drop and pill' remedies, and for his benefactions to his poor patients. A full length statue of him by Angostino Carlini stands in the entrance hall of the Society's House.⁷

During the nine years of his Secretaryship poor health continued to hamper Templeman's work, and by 1768 his illness was evidently becoming worse. On 15th June, 1768,⁸ the Society directed that fifteen guineas be paid to the Assistant Secretary, George Box, for work which he had done during Dr. Templeman's late illness; and on 17th May in the following year 'A Motion was made that Dr. Templeman on Account of his ill state of Health have leave to absent Himself, and to continue as long absent as the nature of his Case requires'.⁹ At a meeting on 11th October, 1769, 'the President acquainted the Society of the death of Dr. Templeman their Secretary', and, after some further business, it was 'ordered that the salary of the late Dr. Templeman be paid his Executor up to Michaelmas last'.¹⁰

There is some uncertainty about the exact date of his death. The date given beneath William Evans's engraving of his portrait in the *Transactions* is 21st September.¹¹ In the *Gentleman's Magazine* the announcement is on the line below an entry for 22nd September.¹² John Nichols, quoted above, gives 23rd September. Thompson Cooper in his notice of Templeman in the *Dictionary of National Biography*¹³ gives 23rd August, but here the month is definitely wrong.¹⁴

Peter Templeman was buried at St. Martin-in-the-Fields on 28th September, 1769,¹⁵ in accordance with the wish expressed in his Will 'as near as possible to the place where my late wife and daughter were interred and in the same manner, that is without pomp'. His will, made in April, 1765, with two codicils dated 4th and 7th April, 1769, contained a few small family bequests and directed that the remainder of his property should pass to his brother Nathaniel, of Lincoln's Inn, who was his sole executor. By the codicils the elder Templeman left mourning rings to the value of five guineas to each of his most intimate friends, Dr. Richard Meyrick, Alexander Small, Samuel More (who succeeded him as Secretary) and Henry Baker, founder of the Bakerian Lectures. Also he left to his 'present servant maid, Martha Pritchard, ten guineas for mourning . . .', and 'to the same Martha Pritchard the yearly sum of twenty guineas to be paid to her during the term of her life by half-yearly payments . . . as an acknowledgement of the care and tenderness which she showed to me in my last illness when I went to Bath to which I in a great measure attribute my living to this time . . .'.¹⁶

So ended Peter Templeman's short life. Though still harrassed by illness, there is no doubt that he found at the Society of Arts scope for his talents and work to his liking, kindness and consideration from its honorary officers, and among its most active members, true friendship.

W. CAMPBELL SMITH

1. *Journal*, Vol. CVI (1958), p. 624.

2. *Practical Observations on the Culture of Lucerne, Turnips, Burnet, Timothy Grass, and Fowl Meadow Grass* . . . (London, 1766).

3. His work was evidently appreciated abroad, for he was elected a Corresponding Member of the Institute of France on 17th March, 1762, on the proposal of Alexandre-Guy Pingré, astronomer, and Mathieu Tillet, botanist.

4. B. M., Letter to Trustees dated 17th August, 1759 and Minutes, C.562 and G.M. 341.
5. John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. II (1812), pp. 299-302.
6. *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. IV (1885), p. 348.
7. *Ibid.*, Vol. LXIX (1899), p. 326.
8. R.S.A., Society Minutes, 15th June, 1768.
9. *Ibid.*, 17th May, 1769.
10. *Ibid.*, 11th October, 1769.
11. *Transactions of the Society of Arts*, Vol. XVII (1799), frontispiece.
12. *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. XXXIX (1769), p. 463.
13. *D.N.B.*, Vol. LVI (1898), p. 53.
14. Thompson Cooper gives his reason for this in *Notes and Queries* (1898, ser. 9, Vol. I, p. 125). It is based on a manuscript note on the death of Peter Templeman in a collection made by the Revd. William Cole for an *Athenae Cantabrigienses* (B.M., Addit. MSS. 5882, f. 105). This quotes from the *Cambridge Chronicle* an announcement 'On Saturday Last' of Dr. Peter Templeman's death, and Cole gives the date of the *Chronicle* as 30th August. The name of the month, 'August', was wrongly copied by Cole. In the same note is quoted the announcement from the *London Chronicle* of 28th September, and in any case 23rd August was not a Saturday but 23rd September was.
15. Parish Registers, St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, Burials.
16. Wills, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1769, October, folio 356.

NOTES ON BOOKS

TIEPOLO DRAWINGS IN THE VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM. By George Knox. London, H.M.S.O., 1960. £3 3s net

The Victoria and Albert Museum possesses the largest single collection of drawings by Tiepolo in the world—some three hundred and thirty of them in all. Until the last few weeks they have been relatively unfamiliar even to students, for the vast majority of them were contained in two bound volumes, difficult to display under museum conditions. Now, however, they have been removed from their original bindings and about half of them put on exhibition on the occasion of the publication of the book under review, the *catalogue raisonné* of this section of the museum's collections.

Giovanni Battista Tiepolo was a particularly brilliant and prolific draughtsman, the last great draughtsman perhaps that Italy produced. Even in his lifetime his drawings were eagerly sought after and his earliest biographer, Vincenzo da Canal, writing in 1732 tells us that it was Tiepolo's practice to sell to foreign collectors whole sketchbooks of his drawings put together in the studio. That the two books of drawings in the museum were compiled in some such manner as this is demonstrable for, in one instance at least, the grey wash with which most of them are shaded has run over the edge of the drawing itself onto the paper of the book, thus showing that it was added in Tiepolo's studio after the drawing had already been laid down on the page.

Mr. Knox does not believe, however, that the two Victoria and Albert volumes were prepared with the intention of selling them to a collector. Indeed, he is of the opinion that the artist abandoned the practice of selling his drawings as soon as he felt he had attained sufficient fame and fortune, probably shortly after Vincenzo da Canal's biographical note was written.

The two volumes are lettered on their spines *Vari Studi e Pensieri* and *Sole Figure Vestiti*, titles which give some idea of their contents, and Mr. Knox is able to show that they include drawings ranging from quite early in Tiepolo's career down to the

period immediately preceding his final departure from Venice in 1762 for Spain, where he was summoned by Charles III to decorate the Royal Palace at Madrid. Pursuing his researches into their history further, Mr. Knox has discovered that the two books of drawings came from Edward Cheney, an English collector, resident in Venice towards the middle of the last century, who showed an unusually discerning interest in Venetian eighteenth-century art at a period when it was totally out of fashion and who possessed no less than seven other similar volumes containing about one thousand of Tiepolo's drawings in all. Having traced the bulk of these drawings, Mr. Knox cogently argues that they comprised the greater part of the artist's drawings remaining in the studio at Venice on his departure for Madrid and consequently that they were probably inherited, when Tiepolo died in Spain, by his widow, Cecelia Guardi, the sister of the well-known painter of Venetian views, a woman who was notorious as an inveterate gambler. He goes on to suggest, though rather more tentatively, that they once formed the greater part of that collection of her husband's sketches which she is recorded as having gambled away one night on a single huge wager. It is an interesting reflection on taste and the constant fluctuations of the art market that the whole collection was acquired by the museum about a century later for £11, an average price of 8d. a drawing. Any one of them would fetch several hundred pounds to-day and many are worth far more.

The collection contains drawings relating to the great majority of Tiepolo's principal decorative commissions, ranging from those for the Palazzo Sandi-Porto executed about 1725/26 to the two earliest known sketches for the Madrid ceilings done on the eve of his departure for Spain. The advantage of this wide range is that it has enabled Mr. Knox to link a very large number of the drawings with commissions for paintings of widely differing dates and thus provide, for the first time, a really acceptable chronological scheme of the evolution of the artist's style as a draughtsman. Many points of importance bearing on Tiepolo's art as a whole emerge in the course of Mr. Knox's discussion of individual drawings—for instance, the fact that the garden sculpture at the Villa Cordellina (where Tiepolo was decorating the *Salone* in the latter part of 1743) was actually carried out from his designs which are included amongst the museum's drawings. Interesting, too, is his demonstration of Tiepolo's dependence on book illustration, e.g. from Montfaucon's *L'Antiquité Expliquée*, to provide him with accurate historical detail for his paintings of classical subjects.

Mr. Knox's catalogue was not actually compiled at the instigation of the museum. It was originally prepared some years ago as a Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of London. That the museum should have undertaken the publication of this thesis by a scholar entirely outside its own organization, shows great enterprise. The admirable volume, like that of the recently published catalogue of *English Furniture Designs*, itself represents a new and most welcome departure on the part of the museum. Both form part of a new series in which it is intended that some of the most important individual groups of works of art in the museum's collection shall be fully illustrated and catalogued with a detail and wealth of scholarship impossible for the entirety of its vast possessions. The format of the catalogues, too, deserves high praise. The Victoria and Albert Museum is the national museum of the arts of design, including printing. That this is so ought to be apparent in all its publications. But all too often in the past the ham-handedness of the Stationery Office (which is responsible for the physical side of the production of the museum's publications) has prevented the museum from carrying out its responsibilities in this respect. The first two books in this new series suggest that such unhappy days are passing. At any rate these two volumes would do credit to the production department of the most typographically conscientious commercial publishing-house.

F. J. B. WATSON

DECORATIVE CAST IRONWORK IN GREAT BRITAIN. By Raymond Lister. London, Bell, 1960. 35s. net

ENGLISH DECORATIVE IRONWORK. By John Harris. London, Tiranti, 1960. 42s. net

THE ENGLISH TRADITION IN DESIGN. By John Gloag. (Second edition revised.) London, Black, 1960. 25s. net

Iron has always stood for strength, but it is really quite perishable and suffers from dampness more than wood. This accounts for the fact that the earliest decorative work, both wrought and cast, has vanished. Decorative cast iron was probably not made in England until the introduction of the blast furnace during the reign of Henry VI (1422-61). Its spectacular five hundred year story is splendidly told in *Decorative Cast Ironwork*. The research in compiling such a work, packed as it is with practical and historical facts is necessarily prodigious. Four types of cast iron are considered: ordnance; domestic; architectural; surveyors'; and there is a concise description of casting technique illustrated with sketches.

The earliest cast iron guns were the mortars of the mid-fifteenth century; the latest, the Victorian cannon now on Tower Wharf, Woolwich, bearing the crowned cypher VR. Mr. Lister recounts the story of James II of Scotland, who was killed by a breech-wedge flying from a cannon at the siege of Roxburgh in 1460. Many a cannon burst during the next four centuries because of flaws in the metal. The founding of guns and cannon balls was carried out in the Weald of Kent and Sussex until lack of raw materials brought about almost a cessation of the trade. The Carron Company, established at Falkirk in 1759, then began gun founding, eventually achieving near-monopoly.

Domestic cast ironwork ranges from firebacks and firedogs of the fifteenth century, through Georgian hob grates, to cast iron covers for electric radiators of the present day. In this chapter Mr. Lister expresses surprise at the batteries of cast iron water closets erected in early Victorian factories and elsewhere: 'as many as thirty-four people may be seated at a time, there being absolutely no privacy beyond narrow dividing cast iron plates'. More surprising, however, is their continued existence in everyday use to the present time, as my own observation has shown. The number of domestic objects made in cast iron overwhelmed the author, who writes 'a mere list would fill this book'.

Cast ironwork architectural ornament dates from the late years of Queen Anne, with the railings encircling St. Paul's Cathedral. In carrying out work on the cast iron railings of the Senate House, Cambridge, erected by James Gibbs in the 1720s, Mr. Lister discovered the interesting fact that the quality of the iron varies from the soft and spongy to the diamond hard.

These early railings were of necessity rugged, with ornament kept to a minimum. Not until the 1770s did architectural cast iron achieve elegance and greater strength. Its use vastly increased, notably by Robert Adam, whose existing railings outside the house of the Royal Society of Arts are in cast iron. In the same decade the world's first bridge in cast iron was built over the Severn at Coalbrookdale, still in use. The stories of this and other iron bridges are outlined. Cast iron was used for the frames of mills, for floridly designed gates and pillars, windows, spiral staircases—even the framework for the Great Exhibition building was in this metal.

Clearly and concisely written, this book contains a valuable bibliography, twenty-three half-tone plates, and line drawings illustrating eighty-three objects. The one notable omission is any reference to malleable cast iron, invented by Samuel Lucas, of Sheffield, in 1804.

For splendour in ornamental ironwork in late Stuart and early Georgian days one must turn to the costlier process of wrought iron. The medieval blacksmith concerned himself mainly with domestic work such as hearth furniture, and his successors achieved little of note during the sixteenth century and most of the seventeenth, but magnificent creations still testify to the exuberant beauty of his craft in the

days of Georgian baroque and rococo. Not until late in the eighteenth century did hand-wrought iron capitate.

The range and style and technique of this decorative ironwork offer a fascinating theme for detailed examination, and in *English Decorative Ironwork* the ideal illustrations are provided from pattern books dating between the 1690s and the 1830s. But the author merely whets the reader's appetite. This chronological survey shows that the fashion for decorative blacksmithing was re-introduced into England by Jean Tijou, who published *A New Booke of Drawings* in 1693, the first of a long series of pattern books to be published during the next century and a half, such as *A New Book of Iron Work* by J. Jores, 1756; *The Smith's Right Hand* by W. & J. Welldon, 1765; *Ornamental Iron Work* by I. & J. Taylor, c.1795, and many others. Ornament was considered more important than construction; garlands, crowns, coats of arms, elaborate leafage and flowers all lent themselves to shaping into complicated forms in the soft iron of the period. The iron parts might cover one another instead of being interlaced. Door lights might be finished not only on the front but also on the back in different designs.

The plates well illustrate the changes of design caused by improved techniques in iron making, heating methods and the tools used, although this important point is omitted from the text. The lower design on plate 100, taken from *The Builder's Magazine*, 1779, illustrating railings, is a typical example of assembly from half a dozen identical units all simply made by any competent blacksmith and his striker. Having made railings from this design myself I can testify to the great speed of production.

The later designs such as Henry Shaw's railings illustrated on plates 166 and 167, were cast in malleable iron, the units file-finished and assembled by labourers rather than costly blacksmiths. This flamboyant ironwork could be produced at about one-third the cost of comparable wrought iron. The final plate, captioned with the date 1836 but engraved with the date November, 1826, is of a pseudo-Gothic staircase and lamp, an elaborate monument to mechanical stodginess. Unfortunately the letterpress accompanying these interesting designs occupies no more than eleven pages, together with five pages of notes to the illustrations. A magnificent opportunity for producing a fully documented story of English decorative ironwork has here been lost.

After so many splendid designs for ornamental ironwork it is sobering to see the English smith's creations viewed in the wider perspective chosen by Mr. John Gloag in *The English Tradition in Design*, where a wrought iron lock, an eighteenth-century inn-sign bracket, a Wolverhampton canal bridge railing show the English craftsman's ability 'to be elaborate without becoming tortuous'. This is a revised and enlarged edition of a book published in 1947.

By the fifteenth century English craftsmen had created a recognizable style in woodwork, while in goldsmithing, embroidery, stained glass and stone carving they had made their achievements celebrated in every European royal court. Mr. Gloag discusses these branches of design briefly but with scholarly exactitude. He devotes a chapter to the master designers and artist craftsmen of the eighteenth century and ends with a glimpse of present-day industrial design.

Despising the nebulous aloofness of so many writers on this subject, he places himself successfully in the rôles of successive craftsmen, observing that 'from the time when the joined chests of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were decorated with roundels of chip carving to the masterly cabinet-making of such latter-day artist-craftsmen as Ernest Gimson and Sydney Barnsley, Ambrose Heal and Gordon Russell, an unmistakable affinity of purpose is apparent, disclosing an affectionate sympathy for materials, a sense of apt selection and gay orderliness in the forms of embellishment, which are inseparable ingredients of the English tradition in design'. This tradition, he suggests, is evident in most other crafts where design is essential for success.

The illustrations are important and have been selected to give 'as a connected story the manifestations of the English tradition in design from the Middle Ages to the present century'. They show particularly how consistently architecture has influenced every branch of design. The first plate, for instance, shows a Norman capital in the ruined nave of Buildwas Abbey, c.1150, its splendid scallop outline reflected in the Victorian valance of Battle railway station platform roof built 700 years later and shown on the same plate. The text is enriched by the introduction of fifty line drawings, including many reproduced from original pattern books, and others drawn by A. S. Cook.

G. BERNARD HUGHES

STUDIES IN LANDSCAPE DESIGN. By G. A. Jellicoe. London, Oxford University Press, 1959. 25s net

At a time when emphasis is often put on the sociological aspect of landscape architecture it is refreshing to be reminded that aesthetics and philosophy are its true roots. Little has been written on this aspect of the subject since the eighteenth century, and the present book brings both vision and scholarship to a reassessment of its basis. The reciprocal influence of painters and the landscape which is a recurring theme throughout the book, perhaps throws light on the recent suspension of life in landscape design. Since a landscape is essentially a synthesis, it may be that the art could not flourish at a time of fragmentation and analysis. Only now, when science and the arts are seeking a new synthesis, landscape architecture can again play a significant and essential rôle.

The author explores man's endless struggle to identify himself with his surroundings and describes the Greek landscape of hill and temple, as the 'rhythm and order of the heavens on the unruly surface of the earth'. Man's early mathematical knowledge limited his recognition of order to simple geometry, but may it not be true that now his wider knowledge perceives a more complex order, he can find new satisfaction in organic forms, provided he knows them to follow universal laws? There can be no doubt that the future of landscape design, like its past, lies in its ability to restore man's 'earthly paradise', in whatever form his extended perceptions may dictate. Its wide range of relevance to present problems is suggested in the arrangement of *Landscape Design*. Based on a series of talks, given over a period of years, it ranges from a lecture on 'Motorways', delivered to the Town Planning Institute, to a historical survey of the age-long search for the 'Paradise Garden' given to the International Federation of Landscape Architects.

This is a valuable and stimulating contribution to the literature of landscape art. It is well produced and the illustrations are outstanding. Many of the fine photographs were taken by the author's wife.

SYLVIA CROWE

PILKINGTON BROTHERS AND THE GLASS INDUSTRY. By T. C. Barker. London, Allen & Unwin, 1960. 40s net

In collaboration with two other economic historians, Dr. T. C. Barker has recently written a pamphlet on Business History for the series of Helps for Students of History published by The Historical Association. This valuable little study is a concise guide to the methods which the authors' experiences have indicated should, if followed, result in a readable, scholarly, business history. *Pilkington Brothers and the Glass Industry* is such a history: within the limitations of its source material it is a model of its kind.

In lucid style, Dr. Barker tells the story of how a partnership established in 1826 by William Pilkington and others has come to dominate the British glass industry.

The reader is guided through the labyrinths of glass technology with consummate skill. What is more, he vicariously experiences the heat of the furnaces, the dirt and smoke of the early glasshouses, and the triumphant satisfaction that must have been felt when, frequently after years of costly and frustrating experiments, technological advances were made by the company. At each stage the personalities of the leading members of the remarkable Pilkington family are discussed and their contribution to the firm's growth assessed. The first generation secured its foothold in the trade by sheer commercial acumen; the second consolidated the firm's position, as competitors collapsed around them, by great technical ability. For ninety years—and it should be mentioned that Dr. Barker's story is mainly concerned with the period from 1826 to 1914—the Pilkington family produced just the right man for the task, and, from the 'Epilogue' and the notes in Appendix 7, has apparently continued to do so.

Once again we are forced to conclude that impersonal economic forces are frequently of less importance in firms' growth patterns than the personalities of the men who managed them. Yet the author always attempts to explain the context within which the company existed. Reference is constantly made to the fortunes of the British glass industry as a whole, to its individual units, and to the fluctuations of the entire economy, particular care being taken to relate the firm's sales to the building cycle. Indeed, it would appear that perhaps the Pilkingtons were more fully aware of the opportunities provided by a cyclical rhythm in their branch of industry than were many Victorian business men. Their careful timing of expansion plans, their periodic attempts to secure technical 'break-throughs' allied to continuous adaptation and development, their sense of market opportunity, and their policies of diversification and integration have been responsible for the company's present position in the world glass industry.

Although Dr. Barker's stage is peopled by figures that live, throughout the study his knowledge of economic theory is implicit, influencing the topics discussed and shaping the book's organization. Thus, although the term is never mentioned, the oligopolistic nature of the glass industry in the later nineteenth century is always clear, and the impact of imports of Belgian glass on the development of the British glass industry realistically handled.

Many questions are left unanswered by this book (and it is one of its merits that one is provoked into asking them), particularly on the side of marketing. It would be true, I think, to call it a production and organizational study. Nevertheless, one always feels that many other themes would have been more fully developed had more complete information been available. Particularly good examples of the questions that might have been answered had it not been for lack of supplementary evidence are suggested on pages 98 and 120-1.

The structure of the book is somewhat complicated: it combines a thematic and chronological approach. This, combined with the author's efforts to introduce details of contemporaneous happenings in other major units in the industry—Chances and Hartleys, for example—occasionally disrupts the flow of the story. Nevertheless, this weakness is partially overcome by the employment of a now regrettably unfashionable analytical table of contents.

Economic historians will be grateful for this book. It illustrates a host of fascinating topics, and one envisages many future lectures being given concreteness by examples taken from it. Particularly fascinating is how the excise taxes distorted the structure of the British glass industry, and how in this, as in so many other cases, industrial capital has been its own progenitor. In sum, this well documented, finely produced and beautifully illustrated study is a credit both to Dr. Barker and to the great family firm whose story it tells.

PETER L. PAYNE

SHORT NOTES ON OTHER BOOKS

MAGAZINE ILLUSTRATION. *By Francis Marshall. London and New York, The Studio, 1959. 35s net*

This addition to the 'How to do it' series is written by a successful magazine illustrator, who describes how an art director commissions work and how the artist assembles his material and builds up his pictures. There are many illustrations of work by the author and others highly skilled in this genre.

CHAPTERS FROM A FLOATING LIFE. *The Autobiography of a Chinese Artist. By Shen Fu. Translated by Shirley M. Black. London, O.U.P., 1960. 16s net*

Shen Fu (1763-1809), a Chinese writer and artist who was also by turns secretary, teacher and merchant, had little material success in life, but his memoirs are still widely read in China to-day. The present abridgement, sympathetically translated, makes it easy to understand why. It is illustrated with paintings of the Ch'ing dynasty.

A MODERN OUTLINE OF LIBRARY CLASSIFICATION. *By J. Mills, F.L.A. London, Chapman & Hall, 1960. 36s net*

Written primarily for those studying for the Registration Examination of the Library Association, this work provides a comprehensive account of developments in library classification over the past twenty-five years.

SELECTED LECTURES IN MODERN PHYSICS FOR SCHOOL SCIENCE TEACHERS. *Edited by H. Messel. London, Macmillan, 1960. 30s net*

A series of lectures delivered at a University of Sydney Summer School in 1958: general discussions of such current topics as nuclear energy, the origin of cosmic rays, physics in rainmaking, solar activity and radio astronomy, space travel and relativity, transistor electronics, precise measurement, superfluids and isotopes in medicine. Illustrated.

ERRATUM

A misprint occurred in Mr. Allan Gwynne-Jones' review of Sir Joshua Reynolds' *Discourses on Art*, which was published in the August issue of the *Journal*. The last line of the third paragraph on page 720 was intended to read 'subtle distinctions are made with ease and grace'.

FROM THE JOURNAL OF 1860

VOL. VIII. 7th September

ON STREET RAILWAYS

[From a paper read in the Mechanical Sciences Section of the British Association meeting at Oxford, by Mr. G. F. Train, of Boston, U.S.A.]

The age of omnibuses in crowded cities has passed; the age of horse railways has commenced. America has introduced the new invention of relieving crowded streets by giving additional facilities for travel; and Europe must sooner or later adopt a similar system

The following are the advantages of the street railways:—

1. Each railway car displaces two omnibuses and four horses, thus relieving streets of one of the main causes of the oft-recurring lock-ups.

2. The wear and tear from these omnibuses being transferred to the rail, as that of many other vehicles that prefer the smooth surface of the iron to the uneven stone pavement, the ratepayers save a large per-centage in taxes.

3. The gas and water commissioners are not inconvenienced with making repairs, as the rails are laid on longitudinal sleepers, which can be diverted in case of need; and as these cars, as well as the carts and carriages that take the rail, move on a direct line, it is a self-constituted police system, saving confusion without expense to the public.

4. The cars move one-third faster than the omnibus; and so gentle is the motion that the passenger can read his journal without difficulty.

5. The rails are so constructed that no inconvenience arises at crossings from wrenching off carriage wheels; and as the improved rail is nearly flat, even with the surface, and some 5 in. wide, no grooves impede the general traffic, and the gauge admits all vehicles that prefer the track to the pavement.

6. The facility of getting in and out at each end of the car and on each side, giving the passengers the choice of four places, together with the almost instantaneous stoppage by means of [the] patent brake, permits travellers to step in and out when in motion without danger, instanced by the fact that nearly 70,000,000 of passengers passed over the New York, Boston and Philadelphia roads last year, with only twelve accidents.

7. In case of necessity troops can be transported from one part of the city to the other at 10 miles an hour.

8. It is a special boon to the working man to buy a ticket from his work in the city to his cottage in the suburb.

In short, the horse railway is as much a necessity as gas, sewerage, the steam rail, or the electric telegraph. Once introduced, you would miss the passenger car as much as any great public benefit.

The advantages of this system are, that you ride in less time, less confusion, less noise, less fear of accident, less mud and dust, and with the additional luxury of more regularity, more attention, more comfort, more room, better light, better ventilation, and a greater facility of ingress and egress. . . .

Street railways in England will soon become a great fact. Birkenhead opens the ball; Liverpool follows; then Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow, and Dublin; and London cannot well hold back after building the Metropolitan Subterranean Railway. A street railway can be constructed directly over it in as many months as that will require years. The former costs £3,000 per mile; the latter £300,000. In the one you travel in the dark; in the other in broad daylight! (Who crosses in the Thames-Tunnel?) The former stops before every man's door; the latter has stations only at intervals. One starts every five minutes; the other every half-minute, if required. The metropolitan blocks up the thoroughfares for months; the street railway for hours only.

Are not the streets of London too narrow? By no means. London streets are wider than those in American cities. Ludgate-hill and Cheapside are of course in your mind. But when we remember that there are some five hundred miles of street in and about London adapted to this system, why select the narrowest to commence with? First construct a line from Bayswater, through Oxford-terrace and the New-road to the Bank; then another line over Westminster Bridge, down those wide solitary streets on the Surrey side of London Bridge, with a branch over Waterloo Bridge to the Strand. This would relieve Fleet-street of a thousand omnibuses, and thus make way for a single line down the centre of the city, to return by another route.

